

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-301

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1983-1984 Session
Report of Proceedings
from 29 to 30 June 1983
Palais des Congrès, Brussels

Contents

Sitting of Wednesday, 29 June 1983	
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Votes, p. 1 — German presidency, p. 2 — European Council, p. 8 — Annex, p. 13	
Sitting of Thursday, 30 June 1983	1
Stuttgart Summit, p. 16 — German presidency and European Council, p. 21 — Votes, p. 51 — Adjournment of the session, p. 51 — Annex, p. 52	

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the six other official languages of the Communities: Danish, German, Greek, French, Italian and Dutch. The English edition contains the original texts of the interventions in English and an English translation of those made in other languages. In these cases there are, after the name of the speaker, the following letters, in brackets, to indicate the language spoken: *(DA)* for Danish, *(DE)* for German, *(GR)* for Greek, *(FR)* for French, *(IT)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

The original texts of these interventions appear in the edition published in the language spoken.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 29 to 30 June 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 205 of 1 August 1983.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 29 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i> <i>Mr Seligman</i>	1	4. <i>European Council — Statement by the President of the Commission Mr Thorn</i>	8
2. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Blumenfeld; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr Blumenfeld</i>	1	<i>Annex</i>	
3. <i>German presidency — Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council Mr Genscher</i>	2	<i>Mr Cousté; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Baillot; Mrs Theobald-Paoli</i>	13

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 5 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 10 June 1983.¹

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, presumably Parliament is aware of the historic start-up of the Community JET Fusion Project last Saturday, 25 June when it achieved plasma. In view of the financial and technical importance of this project, will you send a message of congratulation to Dr Wüster, his team and his associates at Culham, on behalf of the Parliament.

President. — If there is general agreement, I am certainly ready to do so.

¹ Approval of Minutes — Membership of Parliament — Authorization of reports — Referral to committee — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Order of business — Deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions — Speaking time: see Minutes.

2. *Votes*²

BLUMENFELD REPORT (DOC. 1-376/83 'UNFAIR COMMERCIAL PRACTICES')

Proposal for a regulation

Article 12 — Amendment No 1

Mr Blumenfeld (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) Pardon me, Mr President, I do not want to interfere in your business, but I proposed as rapporteur that you should vote on Amendment No 1, and then we can decide what to do next. I am in favour of Amendment No 1.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) I would like to ask Mr Blumenfeld on whose behalf he has now spoken in favour of Amendment No 1, for the Committee on External Economic Relations definitely rejected such an amendment.

Mr Blumenfeld (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) I am the deputy chairman of the committee, and I am grateful to Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul for reminding me of it. On behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations I am, of course, against this amendment. On behalf of my group, I am not.

(Protests)

(The sitting was suspended at 5.30 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.)

² See Annex.

3. German presidency

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the six months of the German Presidency.

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to Parliament for arranging this special meeting, for it was impossible to give an account of the presidency at the ordinary part-session on 7 June. At that time, not only the European Council but ten other Council meetings, some of them of decisive importance, were still pending.

At the beginning of the year, I told the European Parliament of four priority tasks which the Community must carry out: it must combat unemployment, maintain and expand the common internal market, take resolute budgetary action and enlarge the Community southwards.

Meanwhile we have come to the end of an eventful and often dramatic six months. The Stuttgart decisions pointed the way, at a difficult time, towards a new start in the Community. Here are some of the milestones of the first six months: the agreement on the common fisheries policy, the adoption of the 1983 supplementary budget with the discharge for the United Kingdom for 1982, the European Council in Brussels and at the same time the adjustment of exchange rates in the European Monetary System, the agricultural price decisions and the reform of the European Social Fund and, lastly, the economic summit in Williamsburg and the European Council in Stuttgart, which Chancellor Kohl will tell you about tomorrow.

The Community gave and must continue to give priority to combating unemployment. The first results are emerging now. The process of economic recovery has started. Inflation is lower than for years, with a 6.4 % Community average in June this year as against 10.2 % in June last year. The Community's balance of payments is clearly becoming consolidated. The policy of growth and stability called for at the beginning of the year is making progress, although considerable divergences remain within the Community.

The unemployment situation has remained as dramatic as ever: 12 million unemployed in the European Community, of whom more than 40 % are young people under the age of 25, which shows the scale of the tasks before us. The Community must tackle these tasks, even if the main burden of employment policy rests as before with the Member States.

At the Council of Employment Ministers on 2 June and at the Joint Council of Ministers of Employment and Education on 3 June, it was decided to reform the Social Fund. The Fund was adjusted in line with the changes in the employment market situation. In future at least 75 % of the total annually available resources of the Fund will be spent on measures to

assist young people under 25, in particular on their vocational training. That makes 1 700 million ECU for 1983. 40 % of the resources are earmarked for measures to promote employment in structurally very weak areas, the high percentage going to young people will mean that in these structurally weak areas priority will be given to measures to assist young people. By doing so, the Council has also responded to a large part of the requests by this Parliament.

The resolution of the Ministers of Employment and Education on vocational training policy, which was also adopted at the meetings in early June, is an important adjunct to the reform of the Social Fund. Member States also committed themselves in the Council to ensure that in the course of the next five years all young people could take part in a full-time programme, after finishing their compulsory schooling, which includes a basic training and/or the chance to gain preliminary occupational experience. Furthermore, the Member States undertook to continue with their efforts to ensure that older young people with inadequate professional qualifications are given adequate access to vocational training facilities.

With its resolution on vocational training policy and the special scheme for young people, the Council has complied with the demand of the European Council in Copenhagen and Brussels. The planned measures will help improve the employment prospects of young people in the Community.

A good economic policy — we must never forget this — remains the best employment policy. The Community has reached agreement on economic policy guidelines which the Williamsburg economic summit virtually endorsed. These guidelines represent a solid foundation for the lasting and balanced development of economic activity. We are well aware that the dollar trend and the high interest rates are still a difficult problem. That is why the Community will urge its partners in the economic summit to observe the Williamsburg conclusions on interest rate levels and exchange rates. We must always remember that no Community policy can take the place of the efforts it is essential for the Member States to make themselves.

Within the Community, the European Monetary System has once again proved to be a factor of economic and monetary cohesion. The adjustment of the indicative rate on 21 March 1983 helped reduce external economic imbalances, which had reached a level dangerous to the Community's cohesion. In this context it is also worth mentioning the Community loan of 4 000 million ECU which was granted to France on 16 May 1983 to support its balance of payments. That decision is convincing evidence of Community solidarity.

By the Council decision of 19 April 1983, the loan capacity of the New Community Instrument for productive investment in the Community was

Genscher

increased threefold, to 3 000 million ECU. That makes it possible to finance investment projects in the field of energy and technology, and above all projects by small and medium-sized undertakings.

Economic growth in the European Community — and therefore job protection — cannot be achieved without free trade within the Community. With trade between the Member States accounting for nearly 50 % of their total volume of trade, the expansion of the internal market has remained another priority aim. Several Council meetings dealt exclusively with this question. In the first six months of 1983 the Council adopted a regulation and thirteen directives, which provide for direct reliefs for the individual citizens. An example is the directive on tax exemption for the importation of personal removal goods.

Europe must also become visible to its citizens at its borders. I discussed this in detail with a delegation from this Parliament. The work on the action programme on simplifying customs formalities is not completed and must go on. The new cooperation to combat cross-frontier crimes agreed upon in the Solemn Declaration on European Union will make a useful contribution here. What is certain is that the citizens cannot regard the existing situation as regards border formalities as satisfactory.

(Applause)

I call on those responsible to realize that it is precisely here that the credibility of European action is at stake.

(Cries of: 'Who are those responsible?')

We will be holding a debate tomorrow. Then we will be able to discuss it very pragmatically. You know that those responsible can be found in all the families of parties.

(Applause)

Parliament's request to the Council to put renewed emphasis on the question of the mutual recognition of diplomas was taken up by the European Council in Brussels.

On 2 June the Council of Education Ministers indicated ways and means of finding solutions. The guiding principle should be for the responsible authorities to act in as generous and flexible a manner as possible.

Although we can record progress in all these areas, we must not waver in our common efforts to make progress on the central questions for the European internal market, which could not yet be resolved.

That applies in particular to the so-called third country directives, whose adoption would clear the way for more than twenty further EEC directives on dismantling technical barriers to trade. That is why we will continue even after our term of presidency to do our utmost to resolve this difficult complex of problems.

This directive has close practical links with the proposal for a regulation to strengthen the instruments of the common external trade policy.

In line with our obligations under GATT this regulation aims to protect the Community from unfair commercial practices on the part of third countries.

The negotiations are continuing. At present the crucial question is whether the Council or the Commission has the final say in decisions on measures vis-à-vis third countries. We have achieved a rapprochement and laid the foundations for a solution.

Free trade only benefits competitive undertakings. Competitiveness does not depend only on natural advantages relating to location and performance, but also on technical progress.

That is why it is important for the Community to continue with its activities in the field of research and innovation and to make them more efficient.

On 10 March the Council approved guidelines for pluriannual programmes by the Joint Research Centre from 1984.

That settled the long years of dispute about the major Supersara project and paved the way for the Joint Research Centre to carry out a forward-looking programme.

The adoption on 28 June of the framework programme for research and technology is also welcome. The European Council was in favour of the research and development programme in the field of information technology, ESPRIT, being adopted as soon as possible. Similar programmes for telecommunications and biotechnology are to follow.

As before, we are still very concerned about the situation on the steel market. At the Steel Council on 21 June all the Member States agreed in principle on the need to extend the production quota rules pursuant to Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty. Because of the lack of agreement in the European steel industry on the quota distribution it was decided to extend the quota rules, due to expire on 30 June, until 31 July and not to take a final decision on the new distribution of quotas until the Steel Council on 25 July.

The Commission is still legally bound to decide on the re-organization of the steel industry by 30 June 1983. The presidency hopes that the steel industry will show enough economic common sense to reach agreement on the allocation of the quotas. Here too the only viable method lies in compromise.

The Community has devoted special attention to environmental questions. The effects of the Seveso disaster and the death of our forests made the public in our countries sharply aware of the importance of environmental protection as a Community task. The Environment Council took important decisions at its meeting of 16 June on ways of combating air pollution by industrial plant, reducing exhaust gas levels and the

Genscher

lead content of petrol, cleansing the seas and rivers and on the cross-frontier transport of dangerous waste. The Community's environmental policy is on the way to becoming reality. Great priority was attached to it in Stuttgart.

May I also mention a Council decision that shows that our countries are quite capable of acting in solidarity in very specific areas. The 100 m ECU aid for re-organizing the urban infrastructure of Belfast is a particularly noteworthy measure at a time when we are so hard up. It goes back to a proposal from this Parliament and is an act of European assistance to and sympathy with the people of both denominations in Northern Ireland who are suffering severely from the strife there.

Our citizens are directly affected by the decision on the second direct election next year. The Council agreed to the date Parliament had proposed, after weighing up the pros and cons of all the possible dates. In the question of electoral procedure, unfortunately, there has not yet been a breakthrough to the uniform system proposed by this Parliament. The traditions of electoral law on the continent, the uninominal vote in the United Kingdom and the transferable vote in Ireland proved too deep-rooted. Then there was also the very definite dividing line between the principle of nationality and that of residence. The Council, like Parliament, regrets that not all EEC citizens who live in Community countries other than their own will be entitled to vote in the European Parliament election. However, the Council did try to reduce the numbers as much as possible. The objective set out in the Treaties of introducing a uniform electoral system still applies.

As another priority Community task and focus of the presidency's attention, I announced in January that we would take resolute action in the budgetary field. Solid foundations were laid at the Stuttgart Summit, after a series of intensive preparatory meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Chancellor Kohl will give Parliament a detailed account of this tomorrow morning.

Stuttgart cleared the way for structural reforms in the Community's financial and budgetary system. One of the European Council's priorities was to deal with the backlog of problems. We reached agreement on methods and frameworks for resolving the problems relating to the future financing of the Community, the development of Community policies, the questions relating to enlargement, the special budgetary and other problems of certain Member States and the need for stricter budgetary discipline. In the end, all these questions will be resolved jointly, I repeat, *all* these questions.

This package makes all the Member States even more eager to see constructive results in Athens in December. This applies in particular to the Community's agricultural policy, for which guidelines were adopted in Stuttgart.

The Commission will submit proposals on 1 August 1983. Special Councils will ensure that the results of the deliberations which are necessary for the European Council's tasks to be carried out are in fact available by 6 December 1983. I look back with satisfaction at our cooperation with this House. Every part-session, the presidency attended two days of sittings in Parliament. During these six months the Council met a delegation from Parliament twice to discuss questions of Parliament's powers and the next European election. Two days before the Stuttgart summit the President of Parliament discussed the central Community issues with the President of the European Council, Chancellor Kohl. Lastly, Parliament and the presidency had a very intensive dialogue on the Solemn Declaration on European Union.

In my programme speech before this House on 11 January this year, I mentioned as one of my aims the adoption of the Italo-German proposal for a European Act. With the signature of the Solemn Declaration on European Union by the Council in Stuttgart, we have achieved that aim.

During the closing discussions I endorsed the 'essentials' referred to by the President of Parliament and strongly pleaded their cause before my colleagues. The essentials as regards the consultation procedure, the conclusion of the Community's external agreements and of accession agreements were accepted. Yet some partners found they could not agree to the European Parliament's request that the opinion of the plenary session instead of that of the enlarged Bureau of Parliament should be obtained before the President of the Commission is appointed. Other requests by the European Parliament were accepted.

In the final section, the partners agreed on a revision clause which allows for a review of the Solemn Declaration no later than five years after its signature, or even before if this is justified by the progress made on the road to European Union. The Danish Government voiced a reservation about this revision clause. The other points made in the section on the European Parliament have not changed since my statements in the debate on the Croux report on 12 April this year.

As regards the decision-making procedure in the Council, may I add that the text before you underlines the decisive importance of the provisions of the Treaty on decision-making. The Community's ability to act is to be improved by the holding of more frequent votes in the Council. The Ten agree on that. And more use is to be made of abstentions. This clause has already been applied. On the text relating to decision-making, France, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland and Greece placed on record that in the case of questions relating to important national interests, the vote should be postponed, i.e., there should be further discussions until a consensus is reached.

Genscher

By contrast, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Luxembourg, Italy and the Netherlands placed on record that the presidency must hold a vote in cases where the Treaties so provide. So these five founding members reaffirmed the position of the majority in Parliament.

(Applause)

Aside from these questions of particular interest to Parliament, I would also like to point to the main progress made in other areas, which is reflected in the Solemn Declaration. Cultural and legal cooperation is included in the cooperation between the Ten. Both areas are necessary supplements to the cooperation between the Ten. A European Union without these elements would remain an unfinished structure. It is also of importance to Europe to strengthen the cooperation in security policy, which will extend to political and economic aspects. More cohesion and closer cooperation in security policy will give Europe more influence.

The section on the European Community sets out the main objectives for Community projects in the coming years. I note that deletions in the institutional part, which had to be made in the interests of reaching agreement, are offset by extra provisions on the substance of Community policy, on cooperation in external policy, on cultural cooperation and on the difficult question of the approximation of legislation. I entirely agree with those who complain that the institutional part of the Solemn Declaration does not go far enough.

(Applause)

If wishes had been the yardstick of the Italo-German proposal, my colleague Mr Colombo and I would have aimed higher. But we wanted to concentrate on what is feasible today.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I add a remark here. I want to make it quite clear that the future of the Community will depend on whether use is made of the possibilities for the further development of the Solemn Declaration. The future of the Community will depend on whether the restrictive reservations are dropped.

(Applause)

The future of the Community will depend on whether we decide on majority decisions in the framework of the Treaties.

(Applause)

In a future Europe of the Twelve, the observance by certain Member States of the so-called 'Luxembourg compromise' would mean that the Community was blockading itself.

(Applause)

Great efforts, such as those made in Stuttgart at the European Council, cannot simply be repeated at will. Such backlogs of problems as those facing us now cannot be tolerated by the Community for ever.

(Applause)

Everyone must realize that one cannot want to be a member of the Community while wanting at the same time to put a check on its further development.

(Applause)

Those who agreed to the direct election of the European Parliament must also be prepared to grant this Parliament the essential rights of a Parliament.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, European Political Cooperation has become the most important instrument of the Ten's foreign policy. Only if they act jointly can the Europeans obtain a hearing in international policy. If they act jointly, they will be strong enough to assert the interests of Europe.

The role of promoting stability and peaceful balance, which the Ten want to play is gaining increasing respect from other States and the major international organizations. Often, those outside Europe seem more aware of this than the Europeans themselves. The growing importance of European Political Cooperation is a positive development and one that is especially important to Europe's internal and external future. It was only thanks to intensive consultation and coordination of our positions that we managed to face up to the increasing tensions and uncertainties in the world and to assume our share of the responsibility for the solution of international crises and the maintenance of peace and stability throughout the world. Besides earlier documents, this cooperation was based on the foreign ministers' report on European Political Cooperation, the 'London report', adopted in London on 13 October 1981.

The provisions of the London report on strengthening and intensifying European Political Cooperation have proved their worth. A series of improvements was carried out. As a follow-up to a British initiative, agreement was reached on the objectives and procedures of closer cooperation between the consulates in third countries. So this project is actually being implemented. A planning group was created to improve the medium and long-term planning capacity. For replies to questions put by the European Parliament, a procedure was adopted that gives the presidency greater responsibility and more flexibility in answering Members' questions.

(Applause)

Among the international political issues which EPC considered, the development of East-West relations occupied a prime role during the period of the German presidency too. These relations were and still are hampered by the serious setbacks they suffered as

Genscher

a result of the Soviet Union's attitude towards Afghanistan and Poland. The Ten's position towards the Soviet Union is still one of firmness and cohesion as regards the protection of their own interests and principles and the resolve to achieve cooperation and détente. We want to continue the dialogue with the East wherever this is possible and to the benefit of both sides. One important scenario for this dialogue is the CSCE follow-up meeting in Madrid. Since the 'seventies,' the CSCE has led to a very intensive coordination of positions within the EPC, and the same now applies in Madrid. The Ten welcomed the mediation proposal made by the neutral and non-aligned countries in March 1983, since it contained much of what we set out and proposed. Together with other Western countries, the Ten have made a few moderate supplementary proposals.

In Stuttgart on 19 June, the European Council, referring to the initiative of the Spanish President, reaffirmed the view that the adoption of a substantial and balanced final document in Madrid would bring progress for the people, open the way for a conference on disarmament in Europe, give new impetus to the CSCE process and make a useful contribution to improving East-West relations in general. This was designed to bring the Madrid conference out of the dangerous impasse into which it has plunged only a few steps before achieving its aims. We are prepared to agree to the Spanish proposal to mediate, provided all other participants do the same. We must not miss an opportunity decisive to the success of this conference, which is so important to the whole network of the process of détente.

On the question of Poland, the European Council has referred to the strong ties of solidarity between our people and that country. In the view of the Ten, only a national reconciliation which takes full account of the wishes and aspirations of the Polish people can rescue this country situated in the heart of Europe from its deeprooted crisis.

(Applause)

The situation in the Middle East also played an important part in European Political Cooperation during the German presidency. Both the European Council in Brussels in March and the European Council in Stuttgart in June this year made statements on the Middle East in their concluding declarations. Both declarations emphasize the crucial aspects of the development of the situation in and around the Lebanon. Resolving the Lebanon problem is a precondition for finding any comprehensive solution to the conflict in the Middle East. As President-in-Office of the Council, I reaffirmed the position of the Ten before the Lebanese Foreign Minister, Mr Salem, in Bonn on 21 May and repeated that the Ten agreed to support the Lebanese Government. In Stuttgart the Ten reaffirmed their full support for the Lebanese President and his government and urged the withdrawal of

foreign troops from Lebanese sovereign territory. The Ten regard the signature of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement as a step which should be followed by the further steps wished for by the responsible authorities in Lebanon. Among the preconditions for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, the Ten referred in Stuttgart to the principles which they had repeatedly stated in the past, and in Venice in 1980.

The European Council in Brussels called for a just and honourable solution to end the conflict between Iraq and Iran.

During the European Parliament's debate on the situation in southern Africa on 8 February 1983, I said with regard to the Ten's position vis-à-vis Namibia that only free elections in which all the political forces can take part confident of fair and equal treatment, and which are therefore recognized by the international community as an expression of the Namibians' right to self-determination, can lead this country into a prosperous future as a sovereign state. That is why there is no realistic alternative to the solution proposed by the United Nations in Resolution 435. Regarding the situation in South Africa, I pointed out that the system of legally ordained apartheid and the exclusion of the black majority from any political say or co-responsibility is a source of the tensions in the entire region. The Ten see an open dialogue between the government and the authentic spokesmen of all the population groups as the only basis for a secure future for South Africa.

The Ten have repeatedly considered the developments in Argentina because of the human rights situation and with a view to discovering the fate of those who have disappeared. On several occasions they called on the Argentine Government to give a satisfactory account of the fate of those who have disappeared, and in particular of disappeared European nationals. We still adhere to that demand.

On Central America, the Ten expressed their support for the Contadora Initiative, through which Mexico, Colombia, Panama and Venezuela are endeavouring to establish peace and stability in that region on a regional basis. The progress in relations between the Ten meeting in EPC and third countries and organisations was particularly good during the German presidency.

The positive aspects include the more intensive talks between the Ten and the United States on major themes of international policy, such as the CSCE negotiations, the Middle East and the resumption of the dialogue with the two applicant countries Spain and Portugal and the associated State of Turkey. Moreover, the Ten arranged and held the first ever political consultations with the member countries of the Council of Europe which were not members of the Community.

Genscher

The presidency's contacts with other friendly countries such as Norway proceeded equally satisfactorily and were fruitful for both sides.

The Ten's close cooperation with the countries of the South-East Asian ASEAN group continued. It was consolidated at a meeting of foreign ministers in late March this year in Bangkok. Together with my Danish and Greek colleagues, I have just returned today from the so-called dialogue meeting in Bangkok of the foreign ministers of the ASEAN states with the foreign ministers of Australia, Japan, Canada, New Zealand, the USA and the Community.

It was confirmed once again that relations between the two most successful regional groupings of States in the world — the EEC and ASEAN — were of an exemplary close and trusting nature.

On the sidelines of the OECD ministerial meeting on 9 May, we also held political consultations at foreign minister level with Japan, as a troika.

We had the first EPC consultations with China at senior official level. Those talks also underline the international political weight the Ten have jointly acquired.

The troika formula has proved useful and ensures the continuity of EPC proceedings, in which foreign policy cooperation and the Community's external relations must always be seen in their overall context. The Community's external relations encompass the whole world. This explains why the Council considered relations with third countries so intensively.

The Community's enlargement southwards occupied a prime place. It was one of the presidency's priorities. The European Council in Stuttgart, by deciding to present the accession treaties for ratification together with the outcome of the negotiations on the future financing of the Community, created a link between the two issues which should hasten the achievement of both aims.

Immediately after the end of the European Council, I explained this procedure to my Spanish and Portuguese foreign minister colleagues. We agreed that the accession negotiations must now be resumed in a resolute and prompt manner.

The associations with Malta and Cyprus continue to be of special interest to the Community. It looks as though agreement will be reached on a negotiating mandate for Malta in the foreseeable future. It was decided to give the Commission a negotiating brief to renew the financial protocol with Cyprus.

On several occasions the Council has deliberated in depth on the Community's relations with Israel. It found that the agreement between Israel and the Lebanon on ending the state of war and the withdrawal of troops had created a new situation. This

enabled the European Council in Stuttgart to suspend its decision of June 1982. Meanwhile the second EEC-Israel financial protocol was signed on 24 June; this also complies with the requests made in the resolution of this House on 9 June.

The Community has on several occasions expressed its intention to help in the reconstruction of the Lebanon, as also requested repeatedly by this House. On 14 March the Council decided to grant the Lebanon Community emergency aid of 20 million ECU for water supplies for the city of Beirut.

Cooperation with the industrialized States was dominated by the Williamsburg economic summit. President Thorn has given you an account of the proceedings of the summit and the representation of the Community. The Council has good reason to regard Williamsburg as encouraging but also to watch the implementation of the decisions taken there.

Relations with the USA give some cause for concern about protectionist trends and barriers to trade. The issues here are the revision of the US Export Administration Act, special steel exports to the USA and agricultural trade, both bilaterally and on third markets. The Community has constantly sought to hold talks with the USA on this, which has led to better understanding and a more sober viewpoint, but not to any lasting attenuation of the problems.

Relations with Japan remain characterized by the efforts to achieve more balanced trade relations, both by obtaining greater access to the Japanese market and by the Japanese moderating their exports in sensitive sectors. Meanwhile Japan has taken major steps to open its market wider. I expressly welcome this and expect it will soon lead to tangible and practical results. The Council also sees the consultation with Japan in GATT in the same context.

There were two focal points in the association with the 63 African, Caribbean and Pacific States: cooperation in the framework of the current Convention and preparations for the future Convention. The ACP-EEC Council of Ministers meeting on 20 May in Brussels made us aware of the difficulties facing the ACP States as a result of the weak world economic situation. Accordingly the special Council of 19 May on the Stabex system concentrated its attention on the resources allocated to the Fund for use in the years 1980 and 1981. The Community was unable to compensate the ACP States in full for their losses of revenue. But it is likely that for the 1982 application year, the Stabex Fund will once again be adequate to satisfy demands.

During the preliminary work for Lomé III the Council already spoke in favour of continuing the close and exemplary relations with the ACP States. As regards its formulation, the majority of member coun-

Genscher

tries tends to prefer continuing the Convention along the well-proven lines of Lomé II, although with slightly different emphases, to strengthen the dialogue and concentrate the development areas.

The Community is persuaded that North-South relations must be regarded as a basic factor in the revival of the world economy. It is largely thanks to the Community's initiative that special stress was laid on this in the Williamsburg Communiqué. What we are concerned with here is the opening of markets, development aid, the problem of debts and the opening of a dialogue which will be a reply to the message of the non-aligned conference in New Delhi and the meeting of the 77 in Buenos Aires. In this context, the Community is also making its contribution to ensuring that UNCTAD VI produces positive and balanced results. The Community is taking part in the Belgrade negotiations in this spirit. At present that conference has reached a decisive phase. In Bangkok we decided to endeavour jointly with the ASEAN States to ensure the success of that conference.

The Council decided by a qualified majority on 21 June on the implementation of the Community's food aid programme. I have once again requested Parliament to give its opinion by urgent procedure, so that the regulations can enter into force. I have tried to give you a sober account of the focal points of Community activity. Naturally, the picture is not a complete one. To fill in the details, I have presented a written report of the German term of presidency, from which you can obtain further information which may be of special interest to one or other of you.

The day after tomorrow, we will hand over the presidency to Greece. The endeavours to resolve the problems facing the Community will continue. We now look ahead with high hopes to the European Council in Athens. Before this House, I would like to wish our Greek friends luck and success in their task.

The Community needs this success. Whether it fulfils the tasks set out in Stuttgart will be a crucial test for our Community. Scepticism and pessimism are just as poor advisers as national egoism. Scepticism, pessimism and national egoism ignore the fact that European integration is the most epoch-making and positive idea of European and international post-war history. Egoism, scepticism and pessimism ignore the fact that the European Community and European cooperation have brought us all great economic and political progress.

The policy of European integration is a policy of peace. It is in all our interests to strengthen Europe, to further develop Europe; it is not a gift that can simply be given by one to the others — and certainly not something already achieved. To adapt what J.F. Kennedy once said, the motto for our activities should

be: 'Do not ask what Europe can do for you but ask what you can do for Europe'.

(Applause)

We must all realize that to further develop Europe in truth means that we must all invest in the free and peaceful future of our people. That is our European contribution to peace in the world.

(Loud applause)

President. — Thank you very much, Mr President-in-Office. You yourself pointed out that during the German presidency you strongly promoted cooperation with Parliament. You referred to the many debates we had on the Genscher-Colombo initiative. I myself should like to say that the German presidency of the Council has given a strong impulse to the further development of contacts between the Council and Parliament. I regard this as something very valuable and I should like to thank you for your personal efforts in this respect.

(Applause)

4. European Council

President. — The next item is the statement by the President of the Commission on the meeting of the European Council from 17 to 19 June 1983 in Stuttgart.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, rather than make a second speech on the presidential term of office, I would prefer to tell you what conclusions I, as President of the Commission, have drawn from taking part in the European Council of Stuttgart. But first of all, I should like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the German presidency for the effort it has put in throughout the term in what, as you know, were particularly trying circumstances.

Ladies and gentlemen, one might well have thought that, with the international problems and particularly with their election campaign and the formation of a new government, Dr Kohl, the Chancellor, and Mr Genscher, the Vice-Chancellor, would not have had as much time for Europe as they would have liked. Nothing of the sort. They, and the whole of the Federal Government with them, have been deeply involved in all the difficult topics the Council has had to deal with. In spite of the call of domestic politics, and thanks, no doubt, to a true commitment to Europe, the result is a positive one. Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard the account of the President of the Council. It is a considerable achievement, even if it does not fulfil all the hopes that he, we and you were entitled to have.

Thorn

Mr President of the Council, in your speech, you said that you expected the Commission to take a decision on the authorization of aid in the iron and steel sector by 30 June. Allow me to tell you that the decision has already been taken. The Commission decided before I left Brussels this afternoon. So — mission accomplished.

The German presidency's commitment to Europe was particularly evident, as you showed once more this evening, in the President of the Council's tenacity when it came to seeing through the initiative he took two years ago — and in which he was joined by Emilio Colombo, the President at that time. The European Council's adoption of the Solemn Declaration was the culmination of a drive that can only be described as tenacious and patient. Our Commission regrets that not all the Member States saw fit to rise to the level at which Genscher and Colombo proposed setting Europe's real sights. In particular, it regrets to see that the original project has been very much watered down, in particular as regards Parliament's powers and the decision-making procedures.

The difference between the original project and the declaration adopted at Stuttgart very clearly shows, alas, that not all the governments of the Community have the same ambitions for the Europe we are building. One of these days, we shall have to state clearly, in this House and elsewhere, just what Europe and what Community we are hoping to build together! The great merit of the initiative taken by the present President of the Council and the ex-President of this House was that it opened the way without denying any of the achievements. And I have to say, alas, that they have not had the support they would have liked — or as much as they deserved.

Disappointment, however, should not lead us to underestimate the importance of the Solemn Declaration. Our Commission appreciates the meaning of its being signed by the ten Heads of Government, because it sees this as the expression of a personal commitment to maintain the Community's achievements and to continue developing and expanding them. I hope that, for each of the members of the European Council, the declaration is the beginning, not the end, of their ambitions. Although I deplore the reservations that go with the document, I, for one, am strongly convinced that history will fill in the far-too-many blanks in the text.

The Commission did not sign the declaration, as you know, as it feels the declaration comes from the governments and it is a reminder of their commitments. But we could conceivably have had a declaration from the Community as such — although this would have meant associating all the institutions and the European Parliament in particular, as this is directly concerned by a number of important passages in the document.

(Applause)

Mr President, I now come to the other results of the Stuttgart discussions. As you know, the Commission put special priority on the preparation of this particular European Council. In the space of one quarter, we have completed the bulk of the programme for 1983-84 that I presented to you in February.

In the vital sectors of the growth of our own resources, of new schemes and policies and of control over the CAP, everything the Council needed for a declaration was on the table. We were not, of course, hoping that the European Council would be able to untie the many chains shackling the Community at Stuttgart. Quite the contrary. There was every reason to fear failure, and I said as much many times before the Stuttgart meeting. My fear was that divergences of opinion on the diagnosis and the priorities would be such that the Council would be unable to produce a joint policy or a work programme.

There were even rumours to suggest that, in a crisis such as this, some people would seek a way out by venturing into an extra-Community procedure that would be a body-blow to respect for the Treaties and the credibility of the institutions.

Fortunately, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, we cannot always be sure of the worst and we were able to avoid it this time. Nothing has been compromised, although nothing has been definitely achieved as yet because the threat is still there. The European Council has left some enormously difficult problems for its next session; yet I must stress that something extremely important for the future of the Community has come out of the Stuttgart meeting, and it is this. The aims and the terms of reference of negotiations on the future financing of the Community have been clearly laid down. The possibility of boosting our own resources beyond their present level has not, alas, been obtained, but it has not been ruled out either — although it was formally excluded from the defunct mandate of May 1980.

The conditions in which the Community's own resources can be stepped up have been laid down. Together, they constitute a package which will be the subject of one lot of global negotiations within the framework of a Community procedure and the timetable laid down at Stuttgart. This, ladies and gentlemen, is by no means a negligible result, and it was obtained thanks to the personal commitment of Chancellor Kohl, who put the full weight of his authority in the balance to achieve it. It is also proof, if not of a reawakening of the Community spirit among the leaders of all the Member States, then at least of a real awareness of the need to build Europe and to build it fast.

The method chosen may be difficult, but it may be salutary. In the present economic climate, it is reasonable for the Community not to be content just to let

Thorn

out its own resources belt by a couple of notches, for the simple reason that these resources are almost exhausted. It is no bad thing for the Community also to force itself to produce a simultaneous definition of the conditions in which the CAP can be altered, the conditions and priorities for the development of other common policies and the conditions of greater equity in the individual share of the Community budget, so as to decide on the amount of these resources we shall be needing in the near future.

The Council recognized that there was no way we could agree on one item in the package without agreeing on it all. So the negotiations that will be starting in July should lead to an agreement on both the timetable for the increase in Community resources and on the essential elements of a definition of the future of the Community.

Can I now briefly — too briefly perhaps — outline the different items in the package?

I shall start with the alteration of the CAP. This ladies and gentlemen, is both necessary and urgent. It can and it must be done with proper respect for the aims of the Treaty and of our common agricultural policy. We may deplore the fact that the Council was unwilling to do this earlier when the Commission called upon it to do so, particularly in 1981. And we may regret that, today, it is forced to act under the threat of a depletion of its own resources and therefore be tempted to concentrate on one — purely budgetary, alas — approach. That is a fact.

So it is our, the Commission's, duty to tell Parliament that the adaptation and control of the common agricultural policy would still be an imperious necessity even if the problem of the Community's own resources had not come up. The success of the common agricultural policy means it has to be adapted, Mr President, before it gets into an uncontrolled skid which is likely to put an end to it.

If we are to save the common agricultural policy — to which we are attached — and if we are to save these essential principles, we have to be prepared to correct them and to bring them into line where they overstep the mark. That they do, alas, cannot be denied. Are people aware that, for example, when the Community produces 100 ECU-worth of dairy produce, the European tax-payer contributes almost 20 ECU of this and it is 50 ECU when the Community produces 100 ECU-worth of oilseed (colza and sunflowers, that is to say), that crop which is increasingly common across the EEC? Do they realize that, whenever our milk production goes up by 1%, surpluses go up by 11% and there is an extra outlay of ECU 250 million to find as a result?

This cannot be allowed to continue. But bringing the CAP into line with the realities of contemporary agriculture should not be a purely budgetary exercise. It entails changing policies to bring about a better distri-

bution of farm incomes and a reduction of surpluses. Unless we are competitive on the world market, we have to cut surplus production if we are to control agricultural spending and not the opposite. It would be a serious mistake to believe that the requisite changes will bring about a substantial reduction in spending in the short term, as certain finance ministers seem to believe.

It would be impossible to have a sudden drop in surplus production without running the risk of ruining thousands of small farmers — who would have to join the ranks of the unemployed. Take a decision with the Community budget without being willing to adapt the policy, and agricultural spending will crop up again, many times larger elsewhere at national or Community level.

(Applause)

Mr President our Commission did not wait for the European Council's decision before making proposals along these lines. Some of its proposals have been implemented over the past two years and they will soon bear fruit. I am thinking here of the production targets, which will have to be boosted and, where necessary, this device will have to be added to. Before 1 August, my Commission will do as it has been asked and say what practical measures we think need to be taken if we are to control agricultural production along the lines it proposed to the Council on the eve of Stuttgart.

I now come to the development of the Community's other policies.

The European Council has confirmed the desire to develop the Community's action in fields that are vital to the industrial future of Europe, as you indeed hoped, and to its place in the world. These fields are research, innovation and new technology. A policy of principle is evident in the character of the ESPRIT programme, which is recognized to be exemplary.

At the same time, I should, however, express my concern at the hesitation, the understatements and reluctance that the Council is forever displaying in face of the practical prospect of developing new policies, other than the CAP, aimed at translating the solidarity of the Ten into action at last.

(Applause)

In the fields I have mentioned, as in others, proposals have been made to get the Council to put its undertakings into practice. The Commission intends suggesting to it an order priority and specific methods of action to be decided on before the end of this year. This aspect of our action, which has to emerge from the European Council in Athens, conditions the rôle our Community will have to play in the industrial reconversion of Europe in the fight against crisis and unemployment. As you may well imagine, the Commission will need all the support Parliament can

Thorn

provide to get the Council to express its willingness to exploit the Community dimension fully, to foster scientific, technological and industrial development in Europe (particularly in the fields of energy technology, information and telecommunications), to lay down, on the basis of Commission proposals, new policies and schemes to be developed at Community level and to seek ways to ensure that schemes undertaken at national and at Community level are both complementary to and associated with each other.

The Council wondered in Stuttgart about the effectiveness of structural funds. The report the Commission has been asked to produce for 1 August will give it the opportunity to say just what we think the aim of these instruments, is, where they stand in the new financial system of the Community that we have proposed and how they fit in with the other means of action of the Community and the Member States.

Lastly, the European Council is laying down aims for the negotiations on the increase in the Community's own resources — which enlargement in any case makes inevitable — that the Commission itself mentioned in its proposal on the future financing of the Community. Other ideas and other arrangements will no doubt also come up in this debate. The Commission, as I say, is not rejecting any of them *prima facie*, provided they are compatible with the notion of the Community itself. The Commission refuses — and I repeat this clearly — to accept any notion tied up with the idea of fair returns.

(Applause)

It proposes to increase ...

(Applause)

... equity, of course, to increase that Community solidarity that has to be expressed through the budget. And here, our proposal to alter the way VAT is collected seems to be an element in the adaptation of the existing system that it would be difficult to replace.

It is clear that we would have preferred the Council to commit itself more on the principle of stepping up the Community's own resources, but there is such a close link between this principle and the arrangements and conditions for it, that any clear decision of principle would be primarily of symbolic value. This was refused us at this stage, but it is clear that going above the present ceiling on these resources is the focal point of the negotiations about to be held. The Stuttgart declaration provides us with both a foundation and a starting point.

This foundation would have been lacking and Stuttgart would have been doomed to failure if the European Council had been unable — and we have to be realistic about this — to act on a certain promise made to Great Britain in Brussels in March. Disagree-

ment on this point, I have to say, would have led to a crisis of confidence likely to compromise all quests for a long-term solution. These were the terms of the Stuttgart discussions. A political agreement was reached on the basis of a standard, net amount of 750 million ECU, and this is situated, in the terms of the Stuttgart agreement, in the context of the declaration on the future financing of the Community. You must never forget that. It covers 1983, moreover, the year which the Council has to take the decisions that will make for a lasting solution to the problem of the budget. Seeing that there is this agreement, I should like to emphasize the responsibility that we — the European Parliament and the Commission, that is to say — shall have to shoulder.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have not lost sight of the resolution this House adopted on 18 May, when it rejected any new transitional solution in the absence of any clear conception of the future financing of the Community. Your approach, let me clearly state, is the approach of our Commission, which has refused to entertain any intermediate solutions before we have got some way on a long-term solution.

But we all have to realize that nine Member States agreed to grant the tenth compensation for a situation that has been deemed unacceptable. They did this because they felt the gesture was called for to avoid the whole decision-making process seizing up, particularly the one that should lead to a fair and lasting and rapid solution for Community financing. Preventing implementation of this agreement would be tantamount, I fear, to paralyzing the Community during the whole run-up to the European elections. That is what was said at Stuttgart. Rubber-stamping it purely and simply would, for all of us, be abandoning the links with the long-term solution that the Council itself has recognized.

(Applause)

But together, we, Parliament and Commission, hold the key to the implementation of this agreement. So it is up to us to see that honest implementation is carried out within the framework of Community policies and that they actually are linked to the long-term solutions on which the whole future of the Community depends.

The agreement on the long-term solution, which must be reached in Athens, will not be easy. The Council is well aware of the fact, and the difficulty of it is good reason for the decision to use a special procedure that avoids the dispersion of work and the inherent slowness of Council procedures as far as possible. Never in all its history has our Community been forced to tackle so many complex and difficult problems at the same time and in such a short time. It will be negotiating, simultaneously, the changes to the common

Thorn

agricultural policy (which we have been awaiting for years), its development priorities, its new policies, the reorganization of its budget and ways of increasing its resources. It will have to do so with the threat of seeing its own resources for the year run out.

Alongside these internal negotiations, it will also have to negotiate on enlargement, completing the discussions as far as possible. I regret, as you do, ladies and gentlemen, that the European Council did not dare fix a date for the end of the negotiations on enlargement.

However, the link that has been established between the timetable of decisions on enlargement and on the Community's own resources is reassuring, as it increases everyone's desire to move fast.

The programme outlined for the second half of the year is an impressive one, therefore. We have the chapter headings and sometimes an outline of the first paragraphs, but above all, as you will have noticed, we have an enormous number of empty pages. My colleagues and I are aware that it is up to our Commission to start writing the script. We are ready to do so. We have already put in a lot of work over the past few months. We shall continue to do so, which is why I myself suggested the deadline of 1st August — five weeks' time — for handing over all the proposals and reports we have been asked for. Parliament, Mr President, will of course be associated with this. The Commission will pass on all its proposals and communications and hopes that Parliament can give its opinions — and I am sorry about this — by emergency procedure.

After that, it will be the governments' and the Council's turn again. I stress the word 'Council'. What has to be done here is to complete (and in some cases reform) and above all push the Community and

Community policies forward. This is the job of the Community alone, of its institutions alone, and any deviation from this would have been fatal in the past and would still be fatal now. It has been avoided so far, but the Commission and Parliament have to be on their guard as we cannot be sure that the danger is past for good. The Commission wishes officially to confirm here that it will not be involved in any attempt to get round the rules of the Treaty, regardless of any alleged reasons of emergency and efficiency that may be put forward. The special procedures will be Community procedures, or we will have no procedures at all.

(Applause)

So the question is not one of knowing how to convene a group of particularly efficient and able people such as we all have. The Commission has people of this sort, I promise you, and the governments have too, I know. The real question is whether the Commission will be faced with people with the power and the will and the mandate to take decisions.

Having said that, Mr President, I now greet the future Greek President and the Prime Minister, Mr Papan-dreou, with whom the Commission is ready to work in the same spirit of confidence and friendly, European cooperation that has, fortunately, been the hallmark of relations with Dr Kohl and Mr Genscher throughout this first half of the year.

(Loud applause)

President. — Mr Thorn's statement brings us to the end of our agenda¹.

¹ Agenda for next sitting : see Minutes

ANNEX

Votes

The Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the texts of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes

BLUMENFELD REPORT (DOC. 1-376/83 'UNFAIR COMMERCIAL PRACTICES'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 36, 37 and 39 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 4, 8, 20, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38 and 40.

Explanations of vote

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) Although both the resolution and the text we are voting on have been seriously amended and, as we see it, made so flexible as to lack effectiveness, we are in favour because we are anxious to support the Commission, which has presented the Council with proposals for strengthening the instruments of the internal commercial policy.

We wish, in this way, to show our concern with a better organization of the internal Community market and a strengthening of the common commercial policy. We believe that the supervisory measures that will be taken in accordance with the existing regulations will be an effective way of getting the European economy off the ground again and creating jobs. We also think that this text will enable us to combat unfair or excessive measures, as well as those that are prejudicial to European interests. — not to the industrialists alone, that is to say, but also to those who work in the processing and service industries. We have in fact based our approach on an American law which brought in a precise procedure for the assessment of complaints and the taking of decisions. So we are satisfied, Mr President, with the initiatives the Commission has taken.

Although the text has been watered down and is likely to lose its effect, we want the Commission to be inspired by this House's support to ensure that our common commercial policy is increasingly effective and that the Community once more becomes active and dynamic and a creator of employment.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S) — (DE) I will vote in favour of Mr Blumenfeld's report and would like to give a number of reasons of particular relevance to my decision.

Firstly, this decision by Parliament does indeed represent a vote to support the Commission's proposals and a request to several Member States — including mine — no longer to oppose these proposals in the Council of Ministers. The attacks by a large part of German industry which campaigned against these instruments were also repelled. We in the European Parliament have made it plain that we have an interest in a certain aspect of the development of a common external trade policy. We have made it plain that we want to resist the American Government's attempts to take an expansionist attitude *vis-à-vis* European economic interests and that we need a set of instruments in order to do so. In particular, I welcome the fact that Article 12, which is decisive in Parliament's view and provides for immediate action with regard to these instruments, was retained by a majority. That is why we shall vote in favour of this report and the corresponding regulation.

Mr Blumenfeld (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group), on whose behalf I am now speaking, will vote in favour of the report although we did not succeed with our motion to take Article 12 out of the proposal. We think the Council should now finally and very rapidly conclude its activities on the basis of the Commission proposal and that Parliament's opinion, which the Council and the Commission asked it to deliver with great haste, offers a very good basis for concluding this matter.

At this point, however, it must also be said that this instrument which is now being put in the Commission's hands, if the Council agrees, should only be used in cases of emergency, for otherwise we shall run the risk of entering a protectionist phase, which cannot be the purpose of a trading community open to the world, which is what the European Community represents. Now that we have protected the internal market and external economic policy, the Council should at last proceed with the long-overdue strengthening of internal market procedures and should at last accept the Commission's proposals.

Mr Tyrrell (ED) — It is a great pity that Parliament had to deal with this matter in such a rush. It is to Parliament's enormous credit that in three short months it has dealt with such an important, difficult and complex problem as this.

We welcome this proposal and we welcome the report. These are the first steps towards deterring overseas-based companies from indulging in unfair commercial practices to the detriment of Community industry. It is a matter of enormous satisfaction that now at last the Community is at least considering using that enormous economic power which it has, though not for protectionism.

In particular, Community services ought to benefit, and it is a matter of satisfaction that Parliament has advised the Commission and Council to bring them within the scope of this directive.

The procedures still give great cause for concern, and I hope there will be a great deal more thought in the Commission and the Council to make sure they are fair and just than Parliament has been able to give in the short time at its disposal. The definitions are still loose and thoroughly inadequate. We still give far less protection to our own industries than the Americans have for some years now granted to theirs. I hope these two will be reconsidered in the Commission and Council.

Mr Baillot (COM) in writing. — (FR) In spite of the various amendments adopted, the proposed Community regulation still aims to strengthen the commercial policy. We feel that the Community is being positive in taking a firm stand *vis-à-vis* its main competitors in a trade war in which the Ten tend to be victims. This has to change, which is why we feel that the Community has to have common means and instruments, particularly when it comes to competition from America and Japan.

The last few months have shown, especially in agriculture, but in industry as well, that our concern tends to compromise certain interests of the countries of the Community.

So we very much hope that the Council will adopt this proposed regulation as soon as possible. This would be a positive step and it would underline the Ten's desire to foster constructive cooperation.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S) in writing. — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, let us strengthen the common commercial policy against unfair trade practices. This is the only way our industry will be able to develop in an internal framework on a basis of healthy competition.

Take the example of the shipyards. The crisis in this strategic industry has hit all the countries of the Community. It is due to excess capacity in the sea-freight sector, which is itself beset by fierce competition from the countries of Eastern Europe — which probably don't have to operate on an economic basis — and shameless competition from the Far East, where labour costs are low.

At the same time, these countries of Asia and Japan are lending support to their shipyards via a policy of dumping, leading to the expansion of their fleets — but also to an increase in their exports of ships to our countries.

Our Commission has confined itself to encouraging European shipyards to be strong and virtuous, and it forces them to be so by seeking to dismantle the systems of national aid which defend them. But it has done nothing to make them strong *vis-à-vis* their competitors.

So the original text of the Commission's present proposal is particularly welcome.

This, in particular, would be the place for various arrangements proposed at the Council of Transport Ministers by the French Secretary of State for Maritime Affairs with a view to getting the Community — if I may put it like this — to keep its flags at least on the lines that serve it, using ships that it builds in conditions of healthy competition.

Is that too much to ask?

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 30 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Stuttgart Summit — Statement by the President of the European Council Mr Kohl</i>	16	<i>Mr Romualdi; Mrs Salisch; Mr Habsburg; Mr Kirk; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Couste; Mr Saby; Mr Herman; Mr Paisley; Mr Gredal; Mr J. Moreau; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Genscher (Council); Mr Glinne</i>	21
2. <i>German presidency and European Council — General debate on German presidency and on the European Council meeting in Stuttgart</i>			
<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Fanti; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Nebout; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr De Goede; Mr Arndt; Mr Croux; Lady Elles; Mr Piquet; Mr Louwes; Mr Lalor; Mr Bøgh; Mrs Spaak; Mr Ferri; Mr Adonnino; Mr Balfour; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Haagerup;</i>			
3. <i>Votes</i>		<i>Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Forth; Mr Rogers . . .</i>	51
4. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>			51
<i>Annex</i>		<i>Mr Maher; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Baillot; Mr Nyborg</i>	52

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. *Stuttgart Summit*

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the European Council on the meeting of the European Council from 17 to 19 June 1983 in Stuttgart.

Welcome Mr Kohl. You have the floor.

(Applause)

Mr Kohl, President-in-Office of the European Council. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad that today, on the last day of the German presidency, I can report to the European Parliament on the European Council in Stuttgart at this special part-session. I am not so concerned with reporting what has happened. What I want is to consider jointly with you what conclusions we can draw for the Community's future activities. The Heads of State and Government of the Community bear a special

responsibility for European policy. Naturally that also applies to you, the directly elected Members of the European Parliament. That explains the need for a dialogue between the European Parliament and the President of the European Council. This idea was therefore formally embodied in the Solemn Declaration on European Union adopted in Stuttgart.

The European Parliament has the important and vital task of raising our citizens' European consciousness. To do so, it needs authority and its voice must be heard.

(Applause)

But our citizens' European consciousness cannot be raised unless they feel that they, their interests and their problems are being catered for properly in the Community. The founding fathers of Europe, to whom we owe the Community and the splendid idea of European integration, knew it: the Community lives because it guarantees peace and stability in Europe, because it does in truth make us stronger and because thanks to it alone, we become a convincing partner for discussion in today's world and one whose voice is listened to.

But the founding fathers of the Community also knew that the Community must tackle the difficult task of continuously seeking to find a balance between the inter-

¹ Approval of minutes — Documents received : see Minutes.

Kohl

ests of its Member States. Today this is considerably more difficult — and there is no point in arguing about it — than in times of economic prosperity and full cash-boxes. At a time when large undertakings, entire sectors of industry and entire regions of all our countries are hard hit by the economic structural crisis and by unemployment and when we are forced to make large-scale cuts in our national budgets, it becomes more difficult to cope with the problems in the Community.

Then there is a greater risk that the individual questions of agricultural policy, fisheries policy or the budget are given more importance than they really deserve within the dimension of Europe. Then it can happen, and that is the danger facing us, that these questions distort the political horizon in Europe. And that is precisely the moment when we must beware as much of political short-sightedness as of national panic action. That is precisely the moment not to lose sight of the basic political conviction set out in the Treaties of Rome. Their content is well-known. The aims are : a large and free internal market, an open, liberal external trade policy, a common agricultural market, a common development policy and, above all, the institutional development of the Community.

All this rests on the foundation of economic and political solidarity on the part of the Member States of the Community. Especially at a time like now, it is not enough to regard the Community as merely a European free trade zone. I am firmly convinced that the prospect of a future European Union is more necessary today than ever. Today more than ever we need progress along the road towards European integration.

(Applause)

For all these reasons Stuttgart was a difficult meeting, a difficult summit. However much all the participants were convinced — and I believe we can assume they were — that only joint action can bring progress for us all and help each individual Member State to protect its well-understood interests, at the same time this Stuttgart meeting did of course also reflect the economic and financial problems afflicting us all at home. These difficulties narrow down the political room for manoeuvre of the governments and therefore also of the Community institutions.

And yet the European Council in Stuttgart gave an important impetus to the further development of the Community. It set negotiations in motion, fixed actual timetables and provided practical guidelines for these negotiations. Each one of us, myself certainly included, would have liked to have gained more for ourselves out of Stuttgart and we would all have liked to have brought more home for Europe.

(Applause)

But just as national extremist positions can have no place in a European compromise decision of that kind, similarly it would be wrong, unpolitical and also

utopian to try to measure a decision of that kind against an ideal European yardstick. The Stuttgart declarations are a foundation, on which we must and can continue to build very practically in the coming months. That applies both to the Commission and to the Governments in the Council and I am confident that in this work the European Parliament will be at our side in a constructive, realistic and critical spirit and will contribute to ensuring that no-one in the national governments even thinks of postponing the problems facing us *ad calendas graecas*, in the light too of the Stuttgart decisions.

In Stuttgart we were concerned with the Community's budget, with financing the Community and with efficient and economical budgeting. But the real issues were the enlargement of the Community and the relevant preparations, the various Community policies and also new areas of Community policy. We want enlargement — and I am saying this quite deliberately on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany which I lead — we want to keep our promise to the democratic parties and institutions in Spain and Portugal and that is why we want Spain and Portugal to become members soon.

(Applause)

Because we want a Community which does not hesitate before new Community tasks in the fields of research and technology, environmental policy or social policy, we must ensure that in the long term the Community is based on solid financial foundations. We cannot do this applying some patent medicine such as merely increasing own revenue. The Community budget does not exist in a vacuum ; the same rules must apply to it as to our national budgets.

I am speaking to you today after the cabinet of the Federal Republic of Germany embarked yesterday on the difficult job of saving nearly DM 7 000 million for next year alone, which in our case relates to some 30 million inhabitants. Naturally, this obligation to economize, to make budgetary rearrangements, cannot apply only to the national budgets. We in the Community also have an obligation to slow down expenditure on the individual policies, in particular agricultural policy. We must check all the ways in which we can economize and readjust.

(Applause)

The Stuttgart Summit confirmed that these matters cannot be tackled or resolved in isolation.

(Applause)

They are all equally important and must be dealt with at the same time, side by side. There is no alternative for any of us, or for you, to this endeavour. We want to find an overall solution in order to achieve a balance of interests acceptable to all. The European Council in Stuttgart endorsed this view of the German presidency. May I stress that I know of no Member State that does

Kohl

not want to see at least a part of the overall package implemented as soon as possible. That includes the applicant countries of Spain and Portugal. By linking the questions, we should be able to create a new, strong impetus for the implementation of the overall package.

The first in a series of special Council meetings will take place as early as 8 July 1983 under the Greek presidency. These negotiations are difficult, but I do not doubt that we are all prepared to tackle resolutely the problems which we have perhaps for too long pushed aside. In the end we will decide jointly on all these interlinked questions, and we will also decide on the scale and timetable of the Community's own resources requirements, on the basis of the results achieved.

In view of some of the criticism voiced in this House too, which I well understand, may I say quite plainly, to state our position: we Germans do not want a low-key Europe. We do not want to abandon old or new Community policies, transfers of resources or progress in convergence. To increase own resources without at the same time putting a brake on the movement of costs, especially in the common agricultural policy, and without ensuring a fair distribution of the burden, is equally inconceivable.

Moderation is the order of the day. Any additional expenditure must be convincingly justified in view of the sacrifices imposed on our citizens. That is a precondition for a credible European policy. You know that as well as I do. We as politicians must act in line with the votes cast by our electors, and I am saying this now as Chairman of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany: the same electors who voted yesterday in the national election will vote tomorrow, i.e., in June next year, in the European election. As politicians we must look ahead to that election, and no-one in their own country must look at it and say: 'But it's *only* a European election'. It remains an *election*, which involves us all jointly!

I am sure that our fellow-citizens, the electors, are prepared to make sacrifices for Europe. But only if we can show them convincingly that Europe is more than a bank account into which money is paid in the hope of getting more back in the right circumstances.

(Applause)

Failing that vision of Europe, that mental and cultural image of Europe that was always present in the minds of the fathers of the Treaties of Rome, we will not be able to make any progress with Europe. I expect us to fulfil the task assigned in Stuttgart and to have made convincing progress by the time of the European Council in Athens in December this year.

The settlements achieved there will, however, take time to enter into force. That is why, in Stuttgart, we had to agree on an interim solution for the United Kingdom. After lengthy negotiations, we agreed on a political net amount of 750 million ECU for 1983. This settlement takes account of overpayments to the United

Kingdom; accordingly the amount is markedly lower than for 1982. This time, we did not include an additional risk-sharing formula to cover contingencies.

For the rest, we will adhere to last year's settlement, including a 50% German minority share. The Council and the European Parliament will have to negotiate the details in connection with the 1984 draft budget. The interim solution we have found comes close to a long-term financial settlement and the resources must be spent in the framework of common policies. In its deliberations on economic and social questions, the European Council urged that the Community's financial instruments should be used in a comprehensive and coordinated fashion, in order to boost and protect the economic recovery in our countries. Thanks to the increase in the Community loan under the German presidency, these instruments have been considerably strengthened as a whole. The European Council greatly welcomed the decisions of the Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs to concentrate the European Social Fund resources on measures to combat youth unemployment. It also appreciated the resolution on vocational training policy under which young people are to be guaranteed one year's basic training after the end of their compulsory schooling. I regard both measures as highly important and timely contributions to reducing youth unemployment.

As regards the internal market, the European Council recorded progress in certain areas. But we agreed in Stuttgart on the need for further efforts to reduce existing distortions to competition and obstacles to trade on the internal market. We know that in economic policy questions the Community has to rely on the efforts of everyone, i.e., primarily on the efforts made by each individual on his own doorstep. The Community makes the large internal market available. For the rest it can only take flanking action. That is why one of our most important European tasks remains that of coordinating the economic policies of the Member States of the Community more closely. Any State that believes it can go it alone will harm itself and the others.

(Applause)

In the past weeks and months we have made progress in precisely this area, in spite of the different starting points. This progress should encourage us to continue along the same road, while at the same time making full use of the European Monetary System as a political instrument of economic discipline and coordination.

I especially welcome the fact that the European Council emphatically endorsed the proposals we made on questions of environmental policy, in particular the problem of the death of the forests. In view of the acute danger in all our countries, we must take rapid and effective action. National measures are inadequate. We need greater European and international effort. I would like to encourage you to continue to be the moving force in questions of protecting the environment.

Kohl

After more than two years of intensive negotiations, the European Council in Stuttgart managed successfully to conclude the deliberations on the Solemn Declaration on European Union and to sign the Declaration. Some partners still have reservations about certain provisions of the Declaration. Moreover, the content of the Declaration was slightly watered down in the course of the deliberations. We would have been prepared to go further. The same applies to some other Member States. It certainly applies to the European Parliament. But we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that together we can only achieve as much as each of us is prepared to accept for himself.

At this point, I would like to say a few plain words to this House. Of course I understand the criticism, of course I can understand people saying we should have achieved more. But the Members who are sitting here are also members of their national parties at home and may I say quite openly that in this House I sometimes hear tones from one quarter or another which I do not hear at home. I observe with great interest that a number of people express European views here which they do not, cannot or are not prepared to translate into practice in their own party.

(Applause)

Of course it is much easier to express European convictions here. What we need is for these European convictions and decisions to be translated into practice at national party meetings if we want to make progress in Europe.

(Applause)

Because I am aware of these difficulties and very well aware of the differences in emphasis between speeches here and declarations at home, I think that with this Declaration, in spite of all the cuts I admit we have made to it — for I never asserted it was a masterpiece — nevertheless we have moved a few steps forward on the road to European integration. We do not regard the Declaration as final either. It can be reviewed at any time and should be. If, for instance, the big political parties which exist in all countries could find a common conviction — I have suggested this on several occasions — we would have a good chance of making progress soon.

In the Declaration, all the Member States of the Community profess themselves in favour of extending the policies and responsibilities of the Community of Ten in the cultural field, in the field of approximation of legislation, in the field of security policy. Moreover, in that Declaration we are making an attempt to integrate the institutional achievements of the Community and those of the cooperation the Member States and steer them more effectively towards the objective of European Union.

The text of the Declaration makes it clear that all the Member States are prepared to urge facilitating the Council's decision-making procedures by applying the rules laid down in the Treaties, including those on

majority decisions. That is a step forward. However, the fact that some Member States placed on record that in cases where vital national interests were at stake, the Council must continue to deliberate until it reaches unanimity, is consistent with the present state of affairs in the Community. We have to live with it as it is; and we can live with it, even if we wish things were different, and I certainly wish they were, to put it plainly.

(Applause)

The two originators of the Declaration, Mr Genscher, the Federal Minister and Mr Colombo, the Foreign Minister, were especially concerned to give the European Parliament a greater say. However, in this specific area considerable reservations were expressed and in my view it is one of the areas in which the Members of the European Parliament have an especially important educational task to carry out in their national parties. So in this specific area there were reservations, yet we managed to make at least a little progress as regards consultation in the legislative procedure, the negotiation and conclusion of international treaties and the appointment of the president of the Commission.

Parliament is still at liberty to put forward more far-reaching proposals, regarding its own position too, during reviews of the Declaration. As far as I am concerned, I stick to my conviction that the position and authority of the European Parliament must be strengthened.

(Applause)

Our citizens would be well-advised to back up this Parliament by taking part in as large numbers as possible in the forthcoming direct election. Voting for the European Parliament means voting for an effective European policy. And you know as well as I do that more responsibility does not merely mean more power. As things stand, it would be disastrous for Europe if the European Parliament or the national parliaments acted side by side or even at times counter to one another. Important as it is for the national MPs to know what is being thought and done in the European Parliament, it is equally important for you as MEPs to know the restraints and requirements imposed on your colleagues in the national parliaments and on their decision-making. Here I think it is essential for contacts to be improved, and that seems to present a problem in most of the countries.

In Stuttgart, some plain, open and at times angry words were spoken, as is usual, and perhaps also necessary, in talks between partners and friends. But at the same time there was a willingness to compromise, to set aside national wishes where this proved necessary in the interests of Europe. The progress made in Stuttgart is the achievement of all the participants. It is still up to all of us to see to it that the Stuttgart results are soon translated into practice. We have moved towards finding solutions but have not yet found final solutions.

Kohl

We do not have much time. The world in which we are living is not prepared to wait until we have resolved our internal problems. Europe is not an island but is part and parcel of our world with its vast problems and conflicts. The ship of Europe has entered troubled waters, politically and economically. Our economy may slowly recover. But it will not recover just like that. We must tackle the problems firmly and without respite.

The necessary structural adjustments in important areas of our economy — steel, the textile industry, ship-building, to give a few examples — will take time, but they affect many people. When we talk about them we must not look only at the statistics but also at the faces of the men and women concerned who are unemployed. That is why it is so necessary for us to find a European dimension for our industries, especially for our new industries of the future, and to exploit it to the full. We can profit from the advantages of our large internal market, but third parties, to whose markets we also need free access, should profit from them too. A European dimension, however, also means European cooperation in research and innovation, means cooperation between undertakings wherever that is useful and feasible.

This is a year of important decisions in East-West relations. We need steadfastness and solidarity, not only in the Alliance but equally in the Community and among its Member States. The European pillar of the Alliance, of transatlantic relations, must be strong and solid. The Community and its Member States cannot afford to concentrate on internal quarrels in this situation. That could be lethal to our freedom, to our freedom of action and in the end to peace.

We need a strong Europe, a self-confident Europe, if we do not want to become the plaything of world politics. Europe must be strong so that it can safeguard its interests everywhere and so that the Community of free democrats can remain strong in the world.

I say it again: we all need Europe. The nation-state ideas of the nineteenth century will never take us across the threshold to the twenty-first century. I am utterly convinced that if we are to achieve any decisive breakthrough at all, we must achieve it in this decade, in the next and the next-but-one term of this Parliament.

(Applause)

We Germans need this in particular. We live in a divided country and that is why we need Europe even more than others. Only if we are united under the aegis of Europe will we have any chance at all of seeing our nation united in future and in history. That is why I plead so passionately at home — apart from all the important economic and social questions — for the breakthrough to Europe, for the political integration and union of Europe, because this can

promote our own chances as a country and a nation. That is why, and I am speaking quite bluntly and undiplomatically, we are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices on the road to the integration of Europe.

(Applause)

Only a strong and united Europe can conduct the necessary dialogue with the East, together with our friends and allies, and thus have a chance of reaching a settlement. That is necessary to the preservation of peace in the world. I will be able to go and hold my talks in Moscow in the next few weeks with the backing of the solidarity in the Alliance, and with the backing of the European Community and its policy.

The German presidency ends tonight. It was a presidency in a difficult time and anyone who wants to measure it by its results must also measure it by the problems it found facing it. I took over the presidency a few weeks after being elected Chancellor and a few weeks before the Bundestag election. There has been nothing comparable in the history of Europe to date. So anyone who makes critical remarks here must think first of the situation as it was at the outset and then imagine what he himself would have done in that situation.

(Applause)

Naturally, we respected our mandate and now when we hand over the presidency to Greece we do so with best wishes to our Greek friends and partners and in the assurance that our European affairs are in good hands in that country where the idea of freedom and democracy was first conceived in Western history.

Presidency means special responsibilities for the Community and the management of its affairs. The Community exists through the responsibility of all its members. Naturally, there will be especially heavy demands on its members — and not only on the presidency! — in the next few months, in view of the sketch of European policy I have just given.

May I conclude with one very personal remark. I belong to that generation of German politicians which set out after the war, as pupils and students, to tear out the boundary posts, sing European songs and celebrate fraternization. In the emotion of those years we thought we had already created Europe and had long since completed the most difficult part. Meanwhile we have grown older and necessarily more sceptical and realistic. But I do not hesitate to say here that I am utterly convinced — now and especially after these six months' experience in the presidency — that without the emotions of those years and without the ability to understand not just the material things but also the spiritual and cultural connections in Europe, there will be no Europe.

(Applause)

Kohl

Important as economic data are, it is equally important to realize that behind the data and the statistics of unemployment there lie human destinies, which are a challenge to our solidarity; and it is equally important that in addition to our interest in technocratic matters, which a modern European mass society obviously needs, we should also feel this emotion, this sense of a new departure, that we should have not only an intellectual but also a heartfelt conviction.

Certainly, detail can be the devil and at a summit of this kind you will find many devils hidden in the agenda. There are some people, perhaps too many, and incidentally they can be found in all the political groupings in Europe, who are beginning to feel resigned in matters European. To conclude, I would like to say quite simply that I see no cause for resignation, in spite of a number of setbacks which I myself have also experienced and suffered. Elements that have become separated and grown apart in Europe over a period of hundreds of years cannot be brought together again in the space of a single generation, overnight so to speak, from the point of view of history. We need a great deal of perseverance, and there is one entirely convincing rational argument. No-one who rightly or wrongly criticizes the development of Europe has ever been able to answer me one question: what is the alternative to Europe?

(Applause)

Because this is the case, may I appeal to you — and you in turn will do the same to others — in spite of all the difficulties and national problems, which we certainly have and would not deny, and in spite of all the obstacles still put in our way on our historic journey, to persevere regardless! We will reach the goal: the integration, the political union of Europe.

(Sustained applause)

President. — Thank you for your speech, Mr Kohl.

2. German Presidency and European Council

President. — The next item is the joint debate on the six months of the German Presidency and the European Council meeting in Stuttgart.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first to remind the Commission, the current President-in-Office of the Council and the majority of Parliament — those who rejected the essential counter-proposals of the Socialists and the unions during the special session we held on employment last April — that there were two meetings in Stuttgart. The meeting of 18 and 19 June, highly official and unproductive to date, and the meeting of 4 June, where more than 80 000 workers of several nations marched through the streets, at the call of the European Trade Union Confederation, to point up the fundamental importance of unemployment as a Community problem.

(Applause)

As we have here a problem of social justice and as the credibility of the Community is dangerously involved in the eyes of 12 million unemployed, who are bound to be skeptical, we entirely approve the ETUC when it 'Severely condemns the refusal of the Heads of State and Government to take coordinated political responsibility for cutting unemployment and stimulating growth'.

Before Stuttgart, in particular in an open letter which Mr den Uyl, the President of the Union of Socialist and Social Democrat Parties of the Community, and I distributed on 13 May, the socialist movement warned the Community executives of the danger of failing to take any further decisions in the crucial sector of employment. Today, faced with the threat of seeing the number of unemployed grow by a million every six months and the lassitude and the doubts of those union leaders who are most fervent in Europe's cause, the Socialist Group, together with the ETUC, deplores that the European Council proved unable to make an effective contribution to the vital job of orchestrating the righting of the situation.

We are confident in our hope that the forthcoming Greek presidency and the French presidency will be followed in their drive to place employment and the reduction of inequality at the very heart of the Community's economic and social policy. And here I am not using the ETUC's words, but the exact terms of the proposal on the relaunching of Europe which my friend Gérard Jaquet, I and many colleagues of all nationalities tabled, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on 25 November 1982.

Our group has always felt that the quality of the employment policy is an essential indication of European will. We know, of course, that everything hangs together, from the reform of the common agricultural policy to greater own resources and the launching of new common policies. And we are also perfectly well aware that the problem of financing dominates a whole series of topics and the attendant lack of solutions. Nevertheless, the Community's shouldering of heavier coresponsibility in the fields affecting employment is, as we see it, the criterion of a serious, concrete and intelligible set of European beliefs.

I mentioned the Jaquet resolution as I wanted to stress that, by an overpowering majority, our Group was calling for a relaunching of Europe. We want more Europe, not less — but to do specific things. What did our last November's text say? The introduction expressed satisfaction at the prospect which the construction of the Community over the past 30 years has opened for the people of Europe. But it said that this prospect was now threatened by the size of the crisis in the countries of the EEC, by mounting unemployment and by the attendant risks of social deterioration.

Glinne

We mentioned the development aims which should lead to greater social and economic democratization. The ideals of freedom and justice which should characterize this Community we are building mean a relaunching of the Community's employment policy, of its social policy and of its economic, industrial and commercial policy too. But we are forced to admit, alas, that there are bottlenecks in the way the Community is working at the moment and we have to stress, in particular, that, in spite of the efforts of various governments, neither the European Council in London nor the subsequent Councils of Ministers managed to find satisfactory solutions to the decisive problems of the Community's future.

So we have already denounced the constant postponing of major issues, crucial ones even, from one summit to another and from one Council to another. After that, November's text then listed 23 practical proposals, which, if you read them again today, have lost nothing of their point and pertinence when it comes to building or expanding a Europe that is acceptable to the nations and their workers. Eight months ago, we agreed to using new own resources and going beyond the ceiling of 1 % of VAT, provided the development anticipated from the economic recovery thus launched clearly warranted this.

Mr President, the financial crisis in the Community is and has for some time been confirming all our fears. By 6 December we have to have a rigid timetable which will keep the Council and the European Council from putting off vital decisions in this distressing manner. But the vital solving of the drama of the Community's resources means that our peoples have to be given a clear definition of the political aims being pursued in this process. And I repeat, at the forefront of these aims has to be disalienation of the thousands of workers in the countries of the Community and the applicant countries who are still waiting for their Europe, which is just as valid as any other Europe, to be properly taken into account.

(Applause)

Mr Klepsch (EPP). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentleman, honourable Members, I have the honour of expressing my warm thanks, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, to the presidency of the Council and to the Council for their activities.

(Applause)

May we especially congratulate you, Chancellor Kohl, not only for taking on the tasks of the presidency of the Council but also on being elected again as a convinced European, to head your government in the Federal election of March this year.

(Applause)

We believe that the patrimony of Adenauer, Schuman and de Gasperi has found a good heir in you, one who fights with patience and persistence, but also stead-

fastly, and with all your might for the further integration of Europe.

We would also like to thank Foreign Minister Genscher, the President of the Council, for the great improvement in contacts with Parliament during his term of presidency. Appreciation of that was already voiced yesterday; and the other ministers have also shown themselves expert and honest partners in our committees and in plenary session. We hope this will serve as a good example to all the subsequent presidencies and that Parliament will continue to be seen as a valid partner with whom Community problems can be resolved jointly.

As far as expectations of the Stuttgart Summit were concerned, the scene was dominated by pessimists and sceptics, while the remaining area was filled by impossible and fantastic expectations quite divorced from reality. To us, however, it was clear that this time Europe was in a critical situation and stood at a crossroads. I was reminded of a picture I had seen of a convoy in dangerous straits. Some of the ships want to sail faster to tackle the danger. Others want to break away to the side and stay apart, while others again merely want to stay where they are. In this difficult situation we have found a very good admiral *pro tempore* in you, Mr Chancellor, who has managed to keep the whole convoy together and found a way ahead.

(Applause)

The right basic decision was taken, namely to hold the Community together, and we are glad that the aim of political union, to which we all subscribed, is still being pursued steadfastly — although we are not forgetting that it was supposed to have been reached by 1980. Why is this so? Because we have realized that each individual and all of us together derive considerable benefits from the Community; because all its members know that we cannot go back.

This Community is condemned to success, because if it disintegrated into small and medium-sized provincial States that would mean economic ruin for us all and turn us into the political plaything of the interests of others. Only by acting together will we have a chance in future of achieving a free democratic structure and system and a lasting peace in the twenty-first century.

The Foreign Minister spoke of the backlog of problems that need to be tackled. Here I would like to say for Parliament that we have been casting a critical eye on this situation for a long time and have put forward our own proposals on all these problems. We think they were good ones and that the Council was to blame for the backlog of problems throughout the past eight years. So we find it all the more welcome that the central problems were concentrated into a single package in Stuttgart in order to force everyone, in the light of their common interests, to find a solution by December in Athens to the problem of

Klepsch

adjusting the agricultural market, to the problem of own resources, to the accession of Spain and Portugal, to finding a sufficiently good financial mechanism and to achieving a financial settlement.

Parliament did good preliminary work on these questions. I advise you to peruse the relevant resolutions, and especially the Pfennig report on the delimitation of tasks in cases where it must be established what can best be achieved at European and what best at national level. We always support economies, for the Community budget is the only one in which revenue and expenditure are balanced, which manages without net indebtedness or new debts. It is our task to ensure jointly with the Court of Auditors that expenditure is controlled in such a way that we can work cheaply and efficiently.

We welcome the new tasks, on which agreement was reached. We have long since realized, and here we support the Council, that they include environmental protection, science, research and technological, but also the political and economic aspects of security for the Community. We are glad that this further step has been taken. We are also glad about the decision to expand cultural cooperation and to allow more scope for action in the field of combating international crimes and in the difficult question of achieving the approximation of laws. We are glad it was realized that development policy can quite certainly be pursued more efficiently and cheaply at European level.

In summary, we hope to see more than expressions of hope and declarations of good intentions, and that we will implement them jointly, as the Chancellor just said. We welcome the fact that during this term of presidency of the Council the question of convergence of economic and monetary policy was taken in hand and that the foundations have been laid for improving the framework conditions in the Community. Certainly this is due in part to the efforts of many. But such efforts are also the precondition for getting a grip on the problem of unemployment.

May I also convey my thanks for the fact that the Council decided to take special measures under the Social Fund to combat youth unemployment. But as a Parliament, we must say that in all the negotiations now under way three things must not be forgotten. Firstly, it must be recognized that Parliament must retain all its powers and functions as budgetary authority.

(Applause)

This House regards the principle of the *juste retour* as an unacceptable starting point. Secondly, we still maintain that the viability of the Community bodies depends on the institutional structure of the allocation of their tasks. So on behalf of my Group I would like to endorse what President Thorn said yesterday. We

believe that it is for the Commission to propose, that solutions for the Community are worked out on the basis of its proposals and that there must not be any new special procedure of whatever kind for this.

(Applause)

Thirdly, we do not regard as viable the theory put forward in some quarters that a kind of financial ceiling must be created for Europe. We agree with what the Chancellor just said, that we must regard things as a whole, that we must find solutions jointly, with the aim of fully maintaining the character of the Community, protecting the spirit and content of the Treaties and allowing them to develop further, and not just externally — although we welcome the accession of Spain and Portugal — but also in their internal structure, their internal cohesion.

We welcome the fact that Foreign Minister Genscher rightly pointed yesterday to the serious damage the Council's inadequate decision-making mechanism is now inflicting. We call for a return to majority decisions, pursuant to the Treaties, and we thank the five Christian Democratic governments which have specifically endorsed this. We are also in favour of the existing reservations to these documents being removed as soon as possible.

We would like to draw special attention to a further point which has perhaps not been put very clearly yet. We would like the existing gap in the democratic control of power in the Community, namely the power of the Council and its bureaucracy, to be closed, to see Parliament obtain greater powers and to see closer coordination and cooperation with the national parliaments, to control that same power.

(Applause)

We would have liked to see much more. Some of my colleagues will go back to this later. May I just mention one point. We think very poor progress has been made in the central question of dealing with obstacles on the internal market. We expect greater efforts to be made in this area, for we regard the losses of DM 30 000 million of our European economy here as intolerable.

We also find it difficult to imagine that we are to obtain a common European passport, yet personal border controls are to be retained in the old way. That must be changed immediately so that after simplifying the procedures we eventually achieve their total removal, as is the case in the Benelux. We believe that Europe must also be felt and experienced by its citizens, as the Chancellor just said, by ensuring the mutual recognition of examinations and diplomas, which is the basis of freedom of movement and of establishment within the Community and not only in three or four areas, but on a broad front. The petty objections made mainly by certain associations cannot make us waver in that demand.

Klepsch

We expect that by the December summit in Athens, joint efforts will have been made — and here I am grasping the hand the Council has stretched out — by the Council, the Commission and Parliament to implement the package that has been set out as the objective, for we want the Community to live and to develop successfully. We would like to combine our thanks to the German presidency of the Council with a warm welcome to the Greek presidency.

(Applause)

We know that the Greek nation sees itself as a firm part of the European Community and we trust that the Council authority will do its utmost to resolve the tasks before it. It is the task of the European Parliament to act as the lawyer of the Community citizens we represent but also as the guardian of Community interests.

The European policy of integration is an active policy of peace. The European Community is the force of peace in our times. It is the fulcrum and the pivot of all future European initiatives. It represents an irrevocable step away from conflict and towards peaceful life together. That is the European message of peace. Let us therefore work together on European integration.

(Applause)

Sir Henry Plumb (ED). — Mr President, may I join with other Members of this House in welcoming Chancellor Kohl. It is indeed a privilege to be here and to have him with us in this House today, and to thank him for his very positive statement to us.

In speaking with many colleagues from other groups in this House over the last day or two, we received the strong impression that they regard as wholly inadequate the results of the Stuttgart Summit. My group and I share much of this disappointment. Who would have thought that three years after the 30 May mandate we should have made such little progress down the road to the restructuring of the Community's finances? Who would have thought that we should still not have attained a genuine internal market, a truly common market; and many will regard with disappointment the substance of the final solemn declaration of the European union.

In making these criticisms, Mr President, I am in no way casting personal reflections on Chancellor Kohl and the German presidency. Such positive elements as did emerge from the Stuttgart Summit are a credit to, among other things, the energy and the diplomacy of Mr Kohl. But the fact remains that the results of Stuttgart are meagre. One can only hope that the aspirations of Chancellor Kohl will be realized.

As the whole world knows, an important decision which emerged from Stuttgart was that the Community would engage on a series of major negotiations

towards the restructuring and the rendering more efficient of its financial affairs. Certain colleagues in this House and elsewhere have regretted that so much time had to be spent on financial matters at this Council. Once again I can only agree with them and emphasize the view of my group that as long as the budget remains unreconstructed any serious advances in our Community will be rendered difficult almost to the point of impossibility. Over the next six months this Parliament will have an important role to play in the Community's discussions of its financial future, and I am eager, with others, that such a discussion should take place on as knowledgeable and as informed a basis as possible. It is for this reason particularly, and in order to disperse certain misleading ideas current in this House, that I wish to dwell perhaps a little on the attitude of an important Community Member State to the question of restructuring. That Member State is, of course, the United Kingdom.

Much has been said and written both in this House and elsewhere on the British Government's attitude to budgetary questions discussed at Stuttgart. Perhaps I can contribute to clarifying the United Kingdom's position. Firstly, the British Government is in no doubt about the important role of the Parliament in the budgetary process of the Community. Private and public utterances at all levels of the British Government have made this in recent days and weeks perfectly clear. Any suggestion that the British Government wishes to belittle the budgetary role of Parliament in the question of the proposed rebate of 750 million ECU is simply based on a misunderstanding. Indeed, it was the British presidency of 1981 which improved significantly budgetary cooperation between the Council and Parliament and in 1982 laid the foundation for the joint declaration of June.

Secondly, the United Kingdom shares Parliament's dislike of *ad hoc* solutions such as rebates. Who would have thought in 1980 that we would now be debating a fourth British rebate because of the failure of the Council to restructure the Community's budget? Such recurrent haggling lessens the standing of the Community in the eyes of the world and indeed of its own citizens. Obviously nobody believes that budgetary questions are the be all and end all of Community membership. But the Community's budget represents an important part of that structure and the peoples of Europe are shocked at the persistent inability of the Council to place the budget on a more equitable and a logically defensible basis. So in view of these points of agreement how can it be that Parliament and the British Government are sometimes represented as potential adversaries?

Can it be that Parliament still believes that the British Government seeks a *juste retour*? The United Kingdom has never sought this *juste retour* and in 1983 will be, according to present estimates, a net

Plumb

contributor to the tune of 1 150 million units of account even after the proposed rebate is taken into account. So can it be that Parliament believes that the United Kingdom is solely responsible for the postponement of a decision on the enlarging of own resources?

The British Government is not alone in the view that the Community should explore every possible saving on agricultural and other expenditure before it decides to increase the ceiling on own resources. Mr President, this Parliament has been active over the years since we have been members of it in trying to bring about those improvements. I need only name one report of two years ago that was approved in this House that has not been supported since then in its detail by the Council of Ministers. Such is the merest common sense at a time when Finance Ministers in all Community countries are uncomfortably aware of the need for prudent management of government expenditure. If the Community is to set about restructuring its finances it is, moreover, illogical to prejudge the results of this restructuring by deciding beforehand that own resources need to be increased. How is it possible now sensibly to discuss the question of an increase in own resources when none of us know what the shape of the Community's budget will be after December 1983? The reason why I have, perhaps, dwelt at some length on my own country's role in the discussion on budgetary matters at Stuttgart is that I wish this Parliament's discussion on the future of the Community — and of course it is the Community's future which is important to all of us — to take place rationally and based on the facts as they are.

My group hopes that negotiations in the Councils between now and December will result in the common agricultural policy being made more efficient, and of course we have always attached importance to the development of other Community-wide policies for the common agricultural policy, the European Social Fund and the Regional Fund which are good examples of areas which we hope to see developed.

We hope to see other developments as well. We look forward to the enlargement of the Community by the accession of Spain and Portugal. Both these countries are naturally part of Western Europe and the Community will be strengthened by the contribution the Iberian peoples can make to it. So we regard the solemn declaration on European union as a small step in the right direction. But not even its authors regard it as the finishing tape of the race towards European union. The internal market is unhappily not yet a reality. My group will be tireless in its efforts to promote this tangible realization of the European common market.

Mr President, I mentioned earlier that positive things came out of the Stuttgart Summit and in our view the

most encouraging decision of Stuttgart was to set a timetable for the Member States to agree on a concept for the restructuring of the Community's finances. We hope that this restructuring will come about. My group shares the frustration of those who see the Community as bogged down in a sea of figures and financial disputes, even though it is the view of the British people that our country is and will remain an integral member of the European Community.

(Applause)

May I remind this House, Sir, that this view was most recently expressed on 9 June 1983. The British people wish, as do all the peoples of Europe, the Community to be a success and to contribute towards the ever-growing cooperation and unity of the peoples of Europe. Such noble aspirations are at the moment checked by the irrationality of the Community's financial arrangements.

We may criticize the Council for not having cracked the problem at Stuttgart, but, with good will and hard work, the agenda laid down at Stuttgart may have a happy issue at Athens in December. I have often been critical of the Council on various issues, but we in Parliament are occasionally tempted to forget, as we have been reminded by Chancellor Kohl this morning, that the Council has its own rights, its own responsibilities and its own democratic authority. As a Parliament, we sometimes tend to assume that there are simple solutions for all the Council's problems. It is easy, for example, to clamour for an increase in the Community's own resources, but such a step might merely mean the failure to grasp the nettle of reducing agricultural spending and restructuring the Community's finances. I hope, and my group hopes, that the Parliament will continue to press the Council to produce a workable and fair restructuring of the Community budget, and we will always support any appropriate measures to put pressure on the Council to fulfil its responsibilities. The Parliament will, I am confident, choose its weapons carefully. Threats to oppose the short-term compensation proposed at Stuttgart would be an attempt to off-load on to one Community partner the exclusive burden of the Parliament's legitimate dispute with the Council. For the immediate future I am cautiously optimistic. I am hopeful, like others, that at Athens the Council will produce something to meet the demands made of it by this Parliament.

Mr President, I am fond of saying to my country-men at home that the noise which comes from the European Community is not the noise of battle but merely the noise from the construction yard. I believe that there is no more constructive immediate task for the future of Europe than putting an end to the primitive and unsatisfactory financial arrangements that the Community has at present. I believe Parliament as a whole would agree. When we set our budgetary house in order, we should be able to move forward in the

Plumb

way we all wish towards a more unified, a more cohesive — in short, a stronger Europe, and we look forward to the work in the months ahead under the guidance of the Greek presidency.

(Applause from the centre and from the right).

Mr Fanti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, European summits come and go, but the scenario is always the same: all decisions are postponed until the next meeting, relegated to a supposedly near future which in reality turns out to be more distant than ever. This is the image of Europe which public opinion is accustomed to see at half-yearly intervals. The sole exceptions are cases like that of the iron-and-steel industry, where punitive measures taken by a distant authority impose drastic cut-backs in production and jobs or fail utterly to deal with the tragic problem of unemployment, as the European Trade Unions pointed out at their demonstration in Stuttgart.

At first glance, the Stuttgart Summit appears to be no different from previous summit meetings. It was discouraging to see the 10 Heads of State and of Government haggling for a day-and-a-half over the so-called refund to Great Britain, which Parliament has yet to approve, and devoting only the remaining half-day to the many problems at hand. The sole source of satisfaction in all this, by unanimous agreement, is the fact that an historic and irreparable rupture was successfully avoided.

If we look closely, however, we see that the Stuttgart Summit was something else again: it marked the beginning of a different phase which promises to end the monotonous repetition of inconclusive meetings and proceed to a definitive evaluation of European prospects. There are two reasons for this. The first is represented by the overall exhaustion of the Community's financial resources and the danger of cessation of payment, which would be catastrophic. This clearly shows that the problem can no longer be dealt with by postponement. Secondly, the summit has highlighted the development of a precise political project whose purpose is no less than the substitution of the current exploratory phase with a type of Community development corresponding to current economic and political needs and favouring democratic consolidation.

Ever since May 1980 — virtually since the beginning of the term of this elected Parliament — working with a mandate from the European Summit of that time, Parliament and the Commission have painstakingly laboured to draw up a series of proposals for the reform and amplification of Community policies. We believe that these proposals are still valid. It is pointless to remind you of this, ladies and gentlemen.

There are only two points I wish to underline here: the first concerns monetary policy, and the need to proceed with the second phase of the European Mone-

tary System in order to give contractual value to a new European currency in respect to the dollar. It is significant that in the concluding statement issued at the Stuttgart Summit no mention is made of this problem. Perhaps this is because the Stuttgart Summit was preceded and negatively influenced by the Williamsburg Summit. The second significant point is that in April 1981 the European Parliament, with the Spinelli report, asserted the need to increase the Community's own resources. These proposals have recently been re-emphasized by President Dankert as indispensable conditions for any project of renovation. If they had been carried out, perhaps we should not be forced to struggle so today to keep our heads above water. No action was taken on our proposals, which remain no more than a dead letter.

Why were we not heeded, President Kohl? I was pleased at your affirmation that the European Parliament should be heard. I would have preferred to receive an explanation of why in the last four years this has never been the case for essential problems. The answer must be found, and I can suggest one. It is a fact that the Council of Ministers, instead of being the expression of a Community power, has increasingly evolved into a body representing the individual national governments. Thus it has found itself paralysed by an interminable series of reciprocal vetoes.

When the European Parliament is called upon in September to discuss the preliminary project for the reform of the Treaties — the only way to remedy the situation — it will also be acting to oppose this hostile, obstructive attitude on the part of the Council.

With this we touch upon one of the fundamental aspects of the situation, that is, the divergence, or rather the disassociation, between the political forces represented in this Parliament and their desire for Community progress, and the real decision-making body of the Community, which is the European Council. The Council, although made up of political forces present in this Parliament, persists in acting with indifference or even in direct opposition to Community interests. I note that the German Presidency, at the preliminary meeting of 13 June in Luxembourg, had proposed that the Stuttgart Summit be discussed on the basis of an approach which I will not hesitate to describe as a 'counter-reformation'.

When we speak of legitimating the principle of *juste retour* — perhaps with Germany in mind — or of 're-nationalizing' agricultural expenditure (and here, too, the Commission is at fault in the document of 11 June), or of intergovernmental conferences as occasions for discussion and negotiation instead of the Community bodies, we question everything that has been accomplished on the Community level. This is a real danger, as has been demonstrated by the sad waning of the Genscher-Colombo Act, ambitiously launched by the two foreign ministers here in 1981

Fanti

and represented in Stuttgart by an empty, general statement which despite its innocuousness was supported only with reservations by certain Member States.

In Stuttgart, therefore, this 'counter-reformation' was blocked. Now begins a new phase of arduous and difficult negotiations.

If we realize that cooperation and financial and economic integration in certain key productive sectors which power European economic activity as a whole have become unquestionably necessary, the picture becomes complete and meaningful. With a limited Community, shut in behind impassable barriers, what choice is there but to entrust the coordination of industrial policies to the large multinational groups, acting beyond the reach of democratic control?

Precisely because of the lack of a Community financial dimension in these sectors, certain undertakings in Community territory find it easier and more useful to cooperate with American or Japanese firms in order to get the best of a European rival or to obtain technology from outside the Community rather than from other Community countries. In such cases, a reasonable transfer of resources from the national to the Community level would reduce overall expenditure and work to the advantage of all. This is another way to carry out an austerity policy.

It is commonly acknowledged that today no single European country is capable of solving the very serious problems we face, particularly in view of the vigorous competitive offensive launched by the United States and Japan. Increased integration on both the economic and political levels thus becomes a necessity for those who want to overcome the crisis without yielding to the imperialistic cynicism which in one form or another is today attempting to dominate the world.

The Italian Communists will certainly not fail to lend their support in this fight for autonomy and for the Community development of Europe. We hope that many will join us. President Thorn called for Parliament's full participation in the negotiations scheduled to begin after the meeting in Stuttgart. It is a matter for deep concern, however, that Chancellor Kohl and Minister Genscher, the responsible representatives of the Council, made no mention of this.

We welcome this participation, on condition, however, that there be full participation for all in ways to be determined, with the inclusion of all the official preliminary documents which ensure that the presence of the European Parliament is not merely a matter of form.

(Applause)

Mr Bangemann (L) — *(DE)* Mr President, it is always dangerous to be guided by hopes alone and if

we were to judge the results of Stuttgart by hopes alone that would not just be dangerous but also unfair. I do not think we should do that here. Parliament should acknowledge that a step was taken at the Stuttgart Summit and it should acknowledge that the German presidency tackled this Stuttgart Summit with great courage. For it is not easy to embark on an initiative, as Foreign Ministers Genscher and Colombo did, since it always carries the risk of failure. He who does nothing is at least not criticized. He who does something is always in danger of being criticized if it fails. Neither of them failed and I must say to Guido Fanti that he has a short memory in saying that the original draft was a bold design and that we are now disappointed. His group gave a very different — and highly critical — verdict of the original design. I think we should acknowledge that some of what is set out in the Stuttgart document also complies with Parliament's wishes.

(Applause)

Jean Rey, speaking on behalf of the European Parliament, called for a procedure for appointing the Commission which has now been endorsed in the Declaration. I think that is not a negligible achievement. It also means improved cooperation with the Commission, even better than what we have now. Perhaps on this occasion a word of thanks should also be said to the President of the Commission and his colleagues ...

(Applause)

... for the fact that we have made progress here in Parliament and are having discussions such as this one today is, of course, partly because we are both pulling together and the Council is also moving closer to Parliament. It is said in the Bible, and probably Guido Fanti does not read this good book often enough ...

(Laughter)

... 'To everything there is a time'. There is a time to sow and a time to reap. There is a time for disputes and a time for reconciliation. Seeds were sown in Stuttgart and disputes arose there too, and now we are waiting for Athens, where we will reap the harvest and be reconciled!

May I make a further remark on the financial problems. It would certainly be quite wrong for the European Parliament only to make financial demands at a time when the national parliaments have to save. The Chancellor is quite right — and may I thank him most warmly for Stuttgart, for the successful issue there was certainly also due to his skill and endeavours at that summit —

(Applause)

Bangemann

You are quite right, Mr. Chancellor, in saying that we should also endeavour to influence the national parties and national parliaments. I can well understand that a national parliament that is forced to economize might look with some consternation at the European Parliament if it only makes demands. But we are not doing that at all! We are not against economies — for instance in agricultural policy — which would remove the surpluses. That is just what we want!

(Applause)

We are not at all against economies being made and I can tell you — and perhaps you could tell the German Bundestag that too one day — that if we were to abolish the border controls we could save 30 000 million! Think how much we could save if instead of pursuing national development policies we embarked on a common European development policy!

(Applause)

Think how much we would save if instead of working side by side in the national bodies we embarked on a common research policy!

(Applause)

There are so many possibilities. Sometimes the words used worry us — but sometimes we meet with success. At a party meeting, the Chairman of the Christian Democratic Union used a particular form of wording on the financing problem, which the Chancellor then revised. We thought that was a very good thing since it shows that people can learn if they are willing to meet each other halfway. So I think that we definitely have a common task here.

Now I must say to my friend Henry that the problem of financing the Community does of course also have something to do with his government's attitude.

To avoid — and I speak to you in English — a 700 billion misunderstanding, I want to make it quite clear that Parliament will decide in the end whether the budget of this year contains the contribution or not. It will decide positively and favourably only when we get to the basic fundamental system and to more politics in Great Britain.

(Applause)

Let me make a final remark on the prospects for the future. I did not quite agree with what you said on this, Mr. President-in-Office of the Council. You said — I noted it down at the time but am not quite sure whether I am quoting you a hundred per cent right; but this must be more or less what you said — that in the light of Stuttgart we must reconcile ourselves to

the fact that together we can only achieve as much as each of us is prepared to accept for himself. That may describe the present situation, but cannot offer future prospects for the Community. We must muster the strength to make sure that all the pro-Europeans, who want more Europe, who want to achieve more progress in the Community's political constitution too — and this Parliament is currently taking a major step to improve the Community's political constitution — do not let themselves be blocked constantly by a few individuals who do not have enough political imagination to realize the harm they are doing in abandoning Europe on this decisive stretch of road. That is the problem.

(Applause)

Healthy scepticism is always a good attitude to take in politics; no-one would dispute that, because then we are safe from unfortunate surprises. However, we must not allow this scepticism to turn into cynicism and resignation on the part of those very people who always worked for Europe. Yet that is what will happen if the large majority of nations, the large majority of governments of this Community and the large majority in this Parliament does not rouse itself to say: the few who do not want to need not — we want to create Europe and that is why we will no longer allow those few to prevent us! So you should revise just that one sentence.

But since that is my only criticism, you can see that my group is satisfied with the results of the German presidency.

(Applause)

Mrs Nebout (DEP). — *(FR)* It is vital to remember that, following the European Council of Stuttgart, we come to a decisive page in the story of the construction of Europe. Stuttgart was an ambiguous summit where no decisions were taken on the basic European problems on the agenda, yet the meeting was far from being a negative one. Some observers expected to see it relaunch Europe in accordance with the spirit of Messina — and they were disappointed. Others feared failure, which would have made an irreparable break in the Community. In their case too the fears very fortunately came to nought.

To tell the truth, it is too early to draw conclusions about the European Council of Stuttgart. It is in just over five months, in Athens, that we will be able to tell whether Stuttgart was successful or not, after the institutions have completed their negotiations on the major problems that remain to be solved, i.e. the future financing of the Community and the development of new policies.

Nebout

The essential merit of the Stuttgart summit is not just that it avoided failure. It is, above all, that it adopted an emergency procedure for opening negotiations, at the level of all the institutions, on the issues for which solutions are expected on 5 and 6 December. We feel that it is a positive and important thing to situate the negotiations at the level of the institutions, because, unlike ordinary negotiations between governments, the choice of a Community procedure to solve Community problems should make it possible to relaunch Europe.

Our group is particularly interested in seeing the negotiations on the future financing of the Community leading to real, significant progress in Athens. But we hope the way is through a revitalization of existing policies and the development of various new policies (such as are necessary in the industrial sector in particular) and a guarantee of the financial solidarity of the Community. This is why we are calling for the financial compensation granted to the United Kingdom — which, bearing in mind the conditions in which it was negotiated and received by the British government, is a further threat to the financial solidarity of the Community — to be accompanied, and this is something we insist upon, by a commitment on the UK's part to stick to the Community decision on the future financing of the Community. No cynicism or resignation, did you say? Those, then, are the hopes we express, at this stage, for a proper relaunching of the Community via an increase in own resources, to us the only viable solution for the future.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Genscher said yesterday that we have just been through an eventful and dramatic six months. He could not have given a better summary of the meagre results of a German presidency which seemed intent on being almost reckless when it began. In January we heard a whole list of European problems whose solution was to be given priority.

But today we find that virtually nothing has been done. For example, there is no agreement on the reorientation of the Regional Fund that is needed, no progress at all has been made on unemployment, and agreement has not even been reached on a uniform electoral procedure. 'The mountain was delivered of a mouse,' as we say in my country. One thing the Greek presidency can be sure of even now: it can hardly do worse than its predecessor. The last straw was the failure of the Stuttgart Summit: all it produced was the 750m units of account that the British Prime Minister took home with her. Everything else is hot air dressed up in empty but fine-sounding declarations. The increase in financial resources was in fact swept aside during the Council's preparatory meeting in Luxembourg. In other words, no agreement has been reached on the increase that needs to be made

in VAT contributions, which means a further postponement of the accession of Spain and Portugal who have been knocking at the door for seven years now. Nor was there any agreement on a new agricultural policy, and we are now fast reaching the bottom of the money-box. There is not even any new money for a policy on alternative energy or for new technologies. Even the declaration on Political Union has become a sad joke, because it is full of ambiguities and implicitly recognizes the right of veto again.

The President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, said yesterday that the Council of Ministers had never before faced so many problems needing to be solved in so short a period. But no one but the Council itself is to blame for this, because it constantly puts off the decisions it should be taking.

Like Copenhagen and Brussels before it, Stuttgart came to nothing. The question is whether the Commission is not also partly to blame for the failure of the Stuttgart summit. It arrived in the nick of time with its memorandum on new agricultural guidelines, which are in no way new and are also very vague. For example, what exactly does 'a cautious price policy' mean? Does it mean production thresholds or graded prices? What are the measures that must be taken if we are to do away with monetary compensatory amounts? What is the ultimate objective of a study of the agricultural protectionism practised by third countries? Rather than threatening to resign, the Commission would have done better to look in the mirror. Why did the Commission not make its threat to resign absolutely plain in Stuttgart? That would have been politically more effective than reciting the rhetorical lament that we had to listen to for the umpteenth time yesterday.

To conclude, ladies and gentlemen, Stuttgart does not deserve a footnote in a school-book on European integration, because all the problems remain just as they have been for a long time. That is why this debate will have no real political significance unless this Parliament says that it refuses to be made a fool of any longer and unless we are ourselves prepared to begin by rejecting the budget in December and, if that does not produce any results, to send the Commission packing as well.

Mr De Goede (NI). — (NL) Mr President, 10 Heads of State or Government who rule over 250 million Europeans spend two days discussing the relentless demand of one of their number: give me my money back, or else. The provisional outcome of this sorry farce: Mrs Thatcher is promised what is in itself the small sum of 750m ECU and, as her predecessor returned from Munich with the pledge of 'Peace in our time', the Iron Lady returns in virtual triumph, having supposedly saved the Stuttgart summit. Europe remains united, and Britain remains a member. And so on, and so forth.

De Goede

Mr President, I have made our position clear in past debates. We are for a strong European Community, which should encourage peace and cooperation in the frightening climate of world politics. If this Community cannot consist of 10 countries, and I am sorry to say this, then it must consist of nine countries, and that is no rash assessment. On the contrary, it is a position that must be adopted if all the unity and action that is so essential is going to be thwarted every few years by short-sighted and isolationist self-interest. In my view, we are fast approaching the stage when the Nine must take a firm stance. There must be an end to British blackmail. Britain must choose once and for all between being a full member and getting out.

Mr President, the most important news contained in the Stuttgart communiqué was that broadly based negotiations would be taking place in the next six months with a view to tackling the most urgent problems and laying firm foundations for the further, dynamic development of the Community until the end of the decade.

Yet more analyses, scores more studies — the communiqué refers to thirteen on agriculture alone — innumerable Council meetings, and all this without anything like unanimity at the summit on what further action the Commission and the various Councils must take or how Parliament is to face 250 million critical Europeans next year, which also happens to be the Orwellian year of 1984.

Would it not have been a sign of statesmanship for Britain to make a gesture by earmarking the 750m ECU for measures to combat youth unemployment, Europe's top priority, on condition, for example, that all the other Member States each came forward with the same amount? That is only one suggestion, but the Stuttgart summit and the Community as a whole would have gained in credibility, because the fight against youth unemployment would then have had real substance. Britain too would have increased its credibility and been regarded as a more reliable and loyal member of this Community. Mistrust would have given way to sympathy and faith. Using the money to step up the fight against youth unemployment in Britain would also have earned Mrs Thatcher sympathy in her own country.

To conclude Mr President, the German Presidency has not been a success. It has been characterized by stagnation and a lack of initiative. Internal political problems in the Federal Republic are undoubtedly partly to blame. Mr Genscher's personal position was also clearly weakened by the FDP's change of course. The Genscher-Colombo Plan has in the end become a cough medicine for a patient with very serious pneumonia. We are extremely disappointed and can find no satisfaction in the view that the summit passed off reasonably well because there was no clash in the end.

Let us hope that Athens produces Olympian results. We should like to see them in due course, even without what I consider to be pointless special part-sessions of this Parliament.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, let me begin by formally confirming to the German presidency that we acknowledge its endeavours and that especially in the question of future financing we work on the assumption that what the German presidency wanted largely, nearly completely, coincides with what this Parliament and in particular the Socialist Group wants. As regards reducing agricultural expenditure, I have the feeling that the German Government takes a position far closer to that of the Socialist Group than to that of the Christian Democratic Group.

But just because of that, I would have expected, in view of the difficulties facing the European Community as a result of national self-centredness, a more open avowal that compared to what the German presidency actually intended and what was stated in its announcements and in the January 1983 Declaration by Mr Genscher, President of the Council, unfortunately you hardly managed to achieve any of the ambitious aims.

In this respect, I would like to contradict my colleague Mr Klepsch. It is simply not enough in terms of the future of Europe to celebrate the avoidance of any open break as a success or, as a German Christian Democrat did, as the 'miracle of Stuttgart'. If Europe wants to maintain its role as a guarantor of peace and democracy and avoid the danger of fragmentation, the Member States must finally take the pending decisions on financial reform, enlargement of the Community and effective cooperation between the European institutions.

The necessary proposals for solutions were put before the Stuttgart Summit. I need only refer to Parliament's proposal to the Council of 18 May and to the fact that the whole problem must have been clear to all the Council members at least since the mandate of 30 May 1980, i.e. for three years. We must address this reproach to all the governments of the Member States, without regard to political colour or national origin. The task formulated for Athens in Stuttgart did not point any new direction at all. For the Council said less there than it had done much earlier on.

Let me once again repeat my group's position.

Value-added tax can only be increased if this is linked with an effective reduction of agricultural spending, that is to say, specifically with a reduction of structural surplus production, the introduction of stronger market elements, greater use of the co-responsibility levy.

It is also necessary, with a view to future European budgetary policy clearly to define the distribution of tasks between the Community and the Member States.

Arndt

We need to calculate long-term costs and to detail the economies which it would then be feasible for the Member States to make. It must be made clear which tasks must be executed by the Community alone, which must be executed by the national States and which by the Community and the national States.

The Community's value-added tax system should be formulated in such a way as to take account of the differences between per capita incomes and economic productivity in the Member States. The accession of Spain and Portugal is a major *political* priority. This enlargement southwards is another reason why the budgetary problems need to be resolved. But we will resist any attempts to use the budgetary problems as a pretext for delaying or preventing their accession.

When I speak of the future financing of Europe that does not mean to say that I regard finance as the only measure. The European Community is a great historical endeavour to bring together the national States, which have evolved over hundreds of years, into a Community by peaceful means. This endeavour must not be ruined by a money-grabbing attitude.

(Applause)

In the end, Europe will not be revived by Sunday declarations, however solemn, but only by the workaday activities of the Council and Parliament. For our sakes I can only wish that the Council's Sunday declarations would finally coincide with its workaday practice!

Mr Croux (PPE) — (NL) Mr President, Federal Chancellor, Minister, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party it is my task to assess the ceremonial Stuttgart declaration on European Union, which is the outcome of the initiative taken by Ministers Genscher and Colombo in drafting a European Act. I will begin with our general impression. We believe that the ceremonial Stuttgart declaration marks an important stage in the Community's evolution towards Political Union but that the time at which it has come is unfortunately far from perfect. Perhaps the greatest merit of the initiative taken by Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo and the persistence with which they have pursued their goal is that the political situation in the Community is now clear: we now know who does and who does not want to go on and who does not even want to apply the Treaties correctly. This is an important stage in a historical process. For 10 years we have had declarations, first declarations on the need for European Union, now Stuttgart, with the announcement of a new era: we shall see in five years what progress we have made. That is something worth thinking about.

But the time is also less than perfect because it has become obvious that the Council cannot function well as an institution. Firstly, and this has never been stated so openly in our Community before, the docu-

ments themselves reveal how great the division is. Five countries have expressed reservations in the protocol attached to the declaration, one has reservations about important aspects, a second objects to yet other elements. It is there for all to see in the Stuttgart documents. Mr Thorn's question is therefore equally clear: What kind of Europe do we want? Do we want an *à la carte* Community, a Community whose Member States proceed at different speeds? Some say this is necessary if any further progress is to be made. We are opposed to this idea, and we go so far as to predict that progress would not be made even if this idea were adopted. It must be said, after all, that not even what was agreed in the Treaties in the past is being done, and that is a situation that needs to be rectified first.

It has also been said that there is a rift not only in the Council but also between the European Community and the national institutions, the governments and parliaments. We would point out that there is a danger of a rift occurring not only between national governments and European institutions but also — and this is far worse — between the whole of the political class, at both national and European level, and the people, the citizens of Europe. Why? Because every recent opinion poll shows that the idea of building Europe is gaining ground. In the United Kingdom the majority is again for staying in the Community. We have seen the results in France. Other opinion polls in other countries indicate the same trend. This means that those in political power are not responding adequately to this fundamental sign of disappointment among the citizens of Europe. For us this is a historical responsibility, which is not being taken sufficiently seriously at the moment.

Secondly, Mr President, I should like to look at a number of specific aspects of the Act or the Declaration. We hope that the principles will be observed and the objectives achieved and stress in particular our firm desire to see progress made, especially in the fight against unemployment, to which we give a high priority. Work, peace and an environment worth living in in Europe, these are our three major priorities. As regards cultural cooperation, cooperation for peace and security in the political and economic spheres, the harmonization of legislation, we endorse the goals set out in the Act.

As for the institutional aspects, we wish to say briefly but clearly that the texts appear to leave some scope for the role played by Parliament, particularly as regards the three points which Parliament, through its President, has put forward as priorities and minimum requirements. Parliament has said, firstly, that it wants to be involved in the appointment of the President of the Commission. The Stuttgart Declaration says that, before a Commission President is appointed, Coreper's chairman will consult Parliament's enlarged Bureau. This is a step in the right direction.

Croux

We are sorry that it will be Coreper's chairman rather than the President of the Council who will be doing this, not because we have anything against the Permanent Representatives Committee, but because in a democratic system it should be for the highest authority of the Council to make contact with the organ that represents the will of Europe's citizens.

Secondly, Parliament insisted that it must be consulted before international agreements and accession treaties are signed. In the Stuttgart Declaration we read that Parliament's opinion will be heard before the conclusion of important international treaties and before the accession of a new country to the Community. However, both points are followed by an asterisk, indicating reservations expressed by a certain Member State, in this case Denmark.

Again, as regards the third minimum requirement, the improvement and extension of the procedure for consultations between Parliament and the Council, we find something along these lines in the Stuttgart Declaration. We must now make sure that these provisions are actually applied. We shall keep a very close watch on this in Parliament.

But none of this really goes far enough when we consider Parliament's views on institutional matters. Parliament will therefore continue its work in this sphere in its Committee on Institutional Affairs, and we hope that in no more than five years' time the Council, Parliament and the Commission will meet at a historic moment of consultation and consensus, because that is absolutely essential for our Community. It has been said that there is no alternative to the Community. But there is an alternative: the decline and fall of all our countries and of all our peoples. And it is our historic mission to prevent this from happening. I will conclude with these words. Mr Chancellor, Mr Genscher, we have great admiration for what Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo have done, we have personally seen how stubbornly they have defended their project. We shall continue to work with them to improve relations between Parliament and the Council, together with the Commission, until such time as our institutional relations become a great deal better than they are today.

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, having heard the Mr Genscher's report yesterday and the European Council's declaration at Stuttgart, we are fully aware of the remarkable extension of the interests and the responsibilities of the European Community both internally and externally. We have become only too aware of the very heavy responsibilities that lie on the Presidency both in exercising the day-to-day management of Community affairs and, of course, in evolving new policies essential to the future prosperity of our citizens. Not only does the Presidency have to contend with these responsibilities, but this particular Presidency has had to face three general elections in three major countries of the Community. I would like

to take this opportunity — since we have him with us — to offer our warm congratulations to Chancellor Kohl on the great success in Western Germany in March of this year, which meant so much to the future security of Europe.

I would also like to mention the well-known success of the elections in my country. They were a victory for Europe. It meant total rejection of withdrawal from the Community, and over 70 percent voted firmly for remaining in and taking full part in the activities of the Community. I would, perhaps, remind Mr De Goede that apart from the question of equity, European cooperation is not only a matter of money. I would remind him, however, that by the United Kingdom's defence policy and defence expenditure, we in our country are prepared to take the necessary measures to defend the security and freedom of Europe and the West which is something, I believe, his party is not yet prepared to do.

I would like to recall some of the pluses of this Presidency. I think the Presidency, and particularly Mr Genscher, should be warmly congratulated for the negotiating skill in reaching a practical and successful conclusion to the negotiations on the common fisheries policy. This is one which is of benefit not only to our fishermen but to the general economy of the Community. Secondly, I would like to congratulate him and thank him for initiating an integrated programme for Northern Ireland. That was another decision taken under the German presidency which is warmly welcomed since it makes a valuable contribution both financially and psychologically by its spirit of European solidarity, to the economic and social development of one of the least well-off regions of the Community, in conformity with the provisions of the Treaties.

Thirdly, there has been the development of European political cooperation and the realization by all Member States without exception of the need on grounds, not only of self-interest but also of political responsibility, to formulate foreign policies for the Community on the basis of its formidable economic strength. This has been developed very fully by this Presidency. It is indeed only in close cooperation that the influence of the European Community can be exerted, whether in relation to third countries or within international fora such as United Nations or CSCE in Madrid. Contrary to conventional wisdom, I firmly believe that European political cooperation has not weakened but strengthened the internal cohesion envisaged in the Treaties. The effectiveness of European political cooperation can only be strengthened by an efficient and convergent European economy.

Now I come to a couple of minuses. No one doubts the intention of the Germany presidency to improve the cohesion of the internal market. The failure of

Elles

national governments to recognize three essential, basic economic facts has meant the failure to promote the measures to form an efficient internal market, particularly in goods and services already before the Council. This in turn has meant, first, loss in employment opportunities; second, loss in trading profits and, therefore, thirdly, loss in revenue for the Community budget through VAT contributions by Member States. That would improve the Community budget without even considering an increase in the total budget resource.

For these three reasons alone the next Presidency is strongly urged to combine and to pursue the objectives which were so clearly expressed by Mr Genscher in his speech to this House early in January of this year.

My final point concerns the powers of Parliament and its relations with the other institutions of the Community. Here again no one has done more personally than Mr Genscher, together with Mr Colombo, to try and extend the powers of Parliament. This we recognize fully. But we also know the constraints of governments and the fear of passing power to democratic bodies. Indeed, it is only in the last few days, as a result of the Stuttgart Declaration, that the measure of the failure of the Council to recognize again a basic political fact has been revealed. The results of the European elections next year will depend on the effectiveness of Parliament as the only democratic voice of the Community. Any criticisms that come out during the European elections will not be of the work of this Parliament but of the failure of the Council to give us the necessary powers to do our job properly. Parliament itself will continue to do what it can to extend its powers because, after all, Parliaments seize powers, they do not expect and wait to be given them. However, I must warn the Presidencies of the future that if the Council of Ministers and the Commission continue to treat Parliament in this way, the results will be bad not for Parliament but for Europe and for democracy as a whole.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Piquet (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, after Stuttgart, one might well think that the only choice was between a Europe of failure and bottlenecks and a Utopia. But my point is that there is room for a Europe of economic relaunch that generates employment and social progress and reduces inequality, there is room for a Europe that develops democracy and works for peace and security.

The French Communists and allies are not resigned to this choice between a Europe of failure and a

Europe of the impossible. Our 10 countries individually and the Community as a whole have economic, industrial and financial means. The Community holds undeniable trump cards in the economic war and it has to use them to overcome the tensions, not aggravate them. This Europe has a certain political authority with many countries — for which it is even a hope. But it still has to display initiative and imagination and choose policies other than those that have proved failures. This does not, to my mind, mean abandoning, denying or even going beyond the Treaty of Rome. We simply note that the austerity policies have not solved the problems raised by the crisis. And worse — they have aggravated them, as unemployment, slower growth and monetary disorder, to mention but a few, go to show. But that is not what the European Council of Stuttgart dealt with. Its main concerns were the Community's budgetary problems. I do not wish to deny the importance of this, but how is it possible to justify the absence of decisions, and discussions even, on a issue as vital as unemployment?

Finances came up, of course. It is possible to make savings — without threatening the common agricultural policy and its principles and, in particular, its guaranteed incomes. We also noted that, in the Stuttgart communiqué, the Ten, without making any firm or precise commitment, in fact linked enlargement to the financing of the Community. We should like once more to remind you that we are against enlargement. The regulations and budgetary reorganization envisaged cannot rule out the dangers of enlargement, and these dangers, we feel, can and must be avoided, particularly as there are other ways of developing cooperation and trade with Spain and Portugal.

Mr President, I should like to reiterate the fact that, in spite of the different choices of national policies, in spite of the objective differences in situation of each of our countries and in the framework of the respect we have to have for decisions taken democratically by each of our nations, there is room for common initiative. This is true of employment, even if Stuttgart found no answers for industrial development, for workers' rights or for the financial situation.

Europe can and must affirm its personality, first by forging an internal cohesion through the development and better balancing of trade, guaranteeing greater stability of the currencies in the EMS, a new investment policy and up-to-the-minute common policies.

Europe can affirm itself with a vigorous and dynamic policy of cooperation with the ACP States and other third countries, which are a privileged field for the development of trade for us all.

Europe can further affirm its presence in the world in face of competition from Japan and America. Not negatively by cutting back on its ventures into already saturated markets, but by technological innovation and a new quality of trade relations with all countries.

Piquet

And lastly, along these lines, Europe can, I am convinced, bring an element of stability to the disordered international monetary situation by making greater use of the ECU.

Mr Louwes (L). — (NL) Mr President, I wish to make a short statement on my group's position on the financial aspects of what I shall call Stuttgart for the sake of brevity.

First, the compensation to the United Kingdom. Before explaining our position on what was decided in Stuttgart, I should like to say that my group has always found it extremely difficult to justify this compensation. This matter, which drags on and on, is a thorn in our side, undoubtedly because of the atmosphere of extortion and tyranny in which it is played out.

But there is more that worries me. Before accession, the United Kingdom had a different agricultural policy, characterized on the one hand by a relatively cheap package of foodstuffs and on the other by direct incomes support for farmers, known as deficiency payments, all of which came out of the taxpayer's pocket. In the year of accession, 1973, this direct incomes support amounted — if I am not mistaken — to something like £ 300 million. After 10 years of inflation, which the United Kingdom has not, of course, been spared, the amount today would be over £ 1 000 million, a sum which the taxpayers in Mrs Thatcher's country no longer need to pay, at least not for this purpose, but she does not say anything about that. The British consumer now pays just as much for his food as anyone else in the Community, and the British Treasury has in effect been relieved of a considerable burden. So why, I ask myself, should Britain be compensated as well.

Be that as it may, it was decided in Stuttgart that 750 million units of account should be paid in compensation out of the 1984 budget. The position my group adopts will depend on how this amount is entered in the budget.

We reject from the outset any idea of a cheque being handed over. Otherwise, we shall wait and see, aware of our budgetary rights where this non-compulsory expenditure is concerned.

To conclude my remarks on the compensation to be paid to the United Kingdom, I have one comment to make and another question to ask. As I understood it, Mr Thorn and Mr Kohl said this morning that the question of whether or not this compensation is connected with the problem of future financing has now been settled. There is a connection. As the chairman of my group, Mr Bangemann, has already said, we are glad about this. The text was not clear, and the translations did not improve it, but the question has now been answered.

My question on the compensation is this: during the discussions in Stuttgart on the amount of compensa-

tion, was any mention made of the *trop perçu*, the excess that has already been paid? I would much appreciate a clear answer to this question.

I now come to the future financing of the Community. My group would like to view the outcome of the Stuttgart summit positively and with a feeling of hopeful expectation. I fully endorse what Mr Thorn said yesterday and Mr Bangemann said just now. I therefore need do no more than ask one question and make one comment. First the question: against the background of the praises that have rightly been sung of the two Council Presidents, I am curious to know what position the Federal Republic adopted on the raising of a 1 % ceiling and what, for example, was the attitude of the United Kingdom Government. Perhaps that is asking too much. But I should like to have an answer on the Federal Republic's position.

Secondly, the comment I have to make. My group agrees, of course, that the common agricultural policy should be examined to see how suitable it is and how it is being implemented. But we believe it is going too far to make this policy the scapegoat for the failure of the Community's financing. It is certainly not to blame, but that is the impression that is given. There is nothing wrong in wanting new policies in certain areas — a social, regional or Mediterranean policy, for example — but the question of financing must be settled first. Only then can plans be announced, not the other way round, with agriculture being blamed for there being no money left. That is deception of the electorate, Mr President, and it must not be allowed to develop into deception of the farmers.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — At the outset, Mr President, may I say that my colleagues and I regret very much the holding of this session. It is unnecessary, wasteful and adds further to the cynicism of our peoples at our decision-making procedures. It is unthinkable that for reasons of diplomatic niceties, the outgoing German presidency and the incoming Greek presidency could not agree on a date to allow yourself, Mr President, and the Federal Chancellor to come before this House. Indeed, this whole affair underlines the need to prolong the term of office of the Presidency of the Council and also allow for situations whereby the outgoing Presidency reports to a session of the European Parliament following on the conclusion of that Presidency, even if this overlaps with the new Presidency. There is nothing to prevent an incoming President from being present at such a debate.

Mr President, at the beginning of your Presidency I stated that the most pressing issue was unemployment. The situation has not changed. Apart from measures to assist in the fight against youth unemployment, there have been absolutely no concrete decisions to direct EEC resources to those countries and regions where unemployment is at its highest. The

Lalor

Presidency has requested the Commission to carry out detailed analysis and to make full use of Community financial instruments in a coordinated manner. We have had the same pious exhortation for the past 12 months, and no decision. The European Council should no longer take itself too seriously, as only the naive take its rambling declarations seriously any more. Unemployment is destroying our economies. It is producing deep social strains and producing a cynical militant class that no longer attaches importance to a work ethic. My group welcomes measures that will result in vocational training to cope with the new information technologies.

With regard to economic recovery, the Presidency speaks of the implementation of guidelines adopted by the OECD Council of Ministers, and we have more of the same with Mr Thorn being asked for more analyses. For once I am becoming rather sympathetic to Mr Thorn who is constantly being called on to produce analysis after analysis. It must be an extremely frustrating task, particularly when there are ultimately no decisions forthcoming. I would like to ascertain from the Presidency what progress has been made to reduce interest rates. Could we not have a special Council of Finance Ministers with maybe a US representative present to tackle this problem?

As regards the Community's finances, the situation is much more serious than the European Council would have us believe. It is, I understand, quite possible that the Community's budget will run out towards the end of this year. We will then have the ultimate crisis. The European Council has produced a vague, gobbledygook declaration which nobody understands, but which we are told is a decision to take a decision. You will tell us, Mr President, about the difficulties and Mr Thorn will eloquently tell us of the impossibilities. Yet the EEC is transforming itself into a loosely-knit organization where each State must get back what it put into the budget.

Finally, in this regard I must congratulate Mrs Thatcher not only on her electoral triumph in the UK but on her success in getting the governments of the Member States to abandon all Community principles to pay her what she describes as 'my money', her fourth budget rebate according to Sir Henry Plumb this morning. As a politician I must draw the pragmatic conclusion and urge my government in Ireland to submit without delay a special memorandum on Ireland's unfavourable position in the Community and receive the same satisfaction that Mrs Thatcher did. Good Europeans, so to speak, have become a thing of the past.

In conclusion, Mr President, let me say that if Williamsburg showed the weakness of our leaders, Stuttgart marks the end of the EEC as we have known it under the Treaty of Rome. The people are rightly now asking: 'Are you the one who is to lead or shall we find another?'

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, in the statement on the German presidency, the President-in-Office of the Council said:

It is not possible to be a Member of the European Community and at the same time hold up its continued development. Anyone who has voted in favour of direct elections to the European Parliament must concede to Parliament the rights of a parliament.

I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether he was thinking of one Member State in particular, when he used these words. If by any chance it was Denmark, I would point out to the President-in-Office that the Community for which the Danish electorate voted in 1972 was the Community of the Treaty of Rome, that they certainly were not aware that they were committing themselves to the incalculable consequences which the President-in-Office finds logical and that they certainly had no inkling of the possibility that any authority would be transferred from the national parliaments to the European Parliament.

I would further point out that the Danish Government, by associating itself with the solemn declaration in Stuttgart, has ventured so far out into a legal morass with respect to the sovereignty provisions of the Danish Constitution that any step further in that direction will mean that the Danish electorate must be consulted. Of course the Treaty of Rome is not something static; of course the Community can take on new tasks; but, if so, the Treaty of Rome must be amended and, as far as Denmark is concerned, a law has to be adopted which will give authority for such transfers of sovereignty. Just bear in mind that such a law, according to our Constitution, has to be adopted by a 5/6 majority of the votes cast in the Folketing or has to be put to a referendum. On my knowledge of the composition of the Folketing, it will not be possible to secure a 5/6 majority for such a law, and my knowledge of opinion polls in Denmark tells me that only 10% of the Danish electorate are interested in European union.

When the conditions for membership of the Community are tightened up in the way Mr Genscher advocates, it should also be understood that the demands imposed by democratic logic will also lead to a situation in which, sooner or later, a Member State will leave the Community. I am not one of those who deplore that prospect, but I wish to draw attention to the implications of such summary pronouncements. The Scandinavian countries have experience which the Community has not yet had. We have tried political union, and it vitiated and embittered relations between sister nations for centuries. Only when we set aside these fantasies did we achieve a spontaneous and cordial cooperation which even Denmark's reorientation towards the Continent has not been able entirely to destroy.

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to say a word about the balance sheet of the German presidency. It is the job of the President of the Council to be responsible for managing the affairs of the European Community. So it is a continuous process. Every President-in-Office has to take up the dossiers, make progress with them (imaginatively if possible) and hand them on to his successor. The reports we are given in Parliament twice a year should not simply be reports on the state of the Community. We have heard the one on the German presidency, which is fine.

But the main point of this extraordinary session is obviously the Stuttgart Council. The depressing reading of the documents from this summit could trigger reactions of two types — disapproving silence, which would have the advantage of relieving us of yet another speech to add to the many we have heard from the Council over the past few months and which have never been followed up by any really positive action, or else the expression, yet again, of our determination in the face of so much hesitation and so many unfulfilled promises. And ultimately, Mr Genscher, that is the attitude you recommend, as you told us that we should not be discouraged or cynical. But it is depressing to see the Stuttgart documents say that on 6 December, in Athens, it will have taken nine months to list what we have to do. And it is depressing to read that the decisions you feel will have to be taken will be hedged round with a whole series of probable, prior conditions. That is enough to make the most optimistic of us lose the little heart we have left, in spite of what you may think. And take care not to have to spoil the hope of the millions of farmers in Europe, after spoiling the hopes of 12 million unemployed! Although it is true that other policies have to be implemented as a matter of urgency, it would be wrong to use reorganization as a pretext for dismantling the only European policy we have, the common agricultural policy.

One last word. The only European institution with any democratic legitimacy is the European Parliament. If you were politically responsible to this Parliament, I think that, after the Stuttgart summit, you would have been censured by the majority of its Members. If, by some unfortunate chance, the Athens Summit fails to produce any radical change in the Council's defensive, nationalistic, egoistic and short-term outlook, Mr President-in-Office, then I fear that the campaign for the next elections to this Parliament will go against the Council.

(Applause)

Mr Ferri (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our overall judgment on the Stuttgart Summit — allowing for the fact that at one point we justifiably feared the worst — is not a negative one, although perhaps the meeting in itself did not deserve as much.

Apart from the authoritative views we have heard, including those of Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher, it must be acknowledged that in the Solemn Declaration made at the conclusion of the initiative originally known as the 'Genscher-Colombo Act', the heads of state and of government re-emphasized the indissoluble tie between European political union and the solution of the economic and social problems which rack our countries.

One cannot fail to receive the impression, however, that once again we are faced with an enumeration of problems and not an indication of adequate political and institutional means for solving them. We expected something more from the European Council: a common response, a rediscovery of the 'spirit of Messina' mentioned by President Mitterrand. We hoped for the development of new common policies to deal with the very serious and disturbing problems of unemployment and economic recovery, for action to improve and reform the existing policies, to develop resources, and finally to prepare for the accession of Spain and Portugal.

Other speakers from my group have raised these points, and more will undoubtedly do so. I intend to dwell on the institutional aspects of the Solemn Declaration, at which we cannot fail to be disappointed for two reasons: first, we are convinced that the chosen instrument is inadequate, as demonstrated by the successive phases of the Genscher-Colombo Act, weakened but still the object of serious reservations; second, we do not feel that the new institutional balance which should be one of the characteristics of European Union has been sufficiently indicated in this Act.

For my part, I much appreciated an incisive phrase pronounced yesterday by Minister Genscher to the effect that one cannot call for the direct election of the European Parliament and then deny this Parliament adequate powers. This affirmation, which alarmed my Danish colleague a moment ago, has my full support. However, Mr Minister Genscher, there is no reference to adequate powers in the Solemn Declaration. Nor can it be objected that participation, through the opinion of the enlarged Bureau, in the selection of the President of the Commission constitutes adequate power. Perhaps the only definite step is that of a debate and a vote on the Commission's programme, as already requested by Parliament. The essential task and power of an elected Parliament, that is, true participation in the exercise of legislative power, is little enough when reduced to the level of consultation, and represents no more than the competence of a mere advisory committee.

The other essential aspect for us is the exercise by the European Parliament of political control and the improvement of its interrogatory power in connection

Ferri

with answers to questions addressed to the Commission and the Council. Political control presupposes the other pillar of the new institutional balance, that is, a Commission which is really a governing body, even if this phrase is alarming to some people.

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the points that Parliament has already referred to in the resolution of 6 July of last year, points which it will discuss again when it examines the report of the institutional committee in the autumn.

I would like to add that we are not concerned only with the rôle of Parliament, although this is essential. We are also concerned with a democratic balance, with an effective Europe, with a true European Union. This is the path we will indicate at the close of our term of office, making a direct appeal to the governments, parliaments, and political parties of Europe.

I wish to conclude by expressing the hope that the Greek Presidency will prove a positive and fruitful period for Europe and for Greece as well.

Mr Adonnino (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the resolutions approved by Parliament in the past, with the decisive contribution of the group of the EPP, bear witness to the expectations raised by the European Council at Stuttgart in view of the serious stagnation of the process of Community development, which was even threatening to damage the few instruments of integration that do exist. This is with particular reference to the complex economic and financial situation regarding the balanced evolution of the Community budget. Unfortunately, as in Stuttgart, this issue threatens to take up all the attention of the institutions and of public opinion.

Expectations were all the more marked because of disappointment at the Council of 13 June, which appeared to be oriented towards a Community philosophy centred on the legitimization of 'budgetary balances', on the 're-nationalization' of agricultural expenditure, and particularly on the introduction of financial instruments outside the integral logic of the Community budget.

I acknowledge the contribution of Chancellor Kohl, whose commitment and competence clearly restored the discussion in Stuttgart to the Community context. I am very pleased at this, even though I have the impression that the positive aspect of the political result should be valued more for what it prevented from happening than for the positive solutions accepted.

Once again goals were identified; guidelines were indicated; new proposals were selected for further study and eventual presentation, but we are still only at the initial phase of the procedure. The next summit will be held in Athens, and therefore it is natural that the

discussion on the close of this half-yearly period should also have some relevance to the following one.

The two aspects of the conclusions of the European Council in Stuttgart which should be most appreciated are the affirmation of the global approach to the solution of individual problems and the indication of solutions valid for adequate periods.

Certain conditions were mentioned, principally that of savings, both as control of surplus agricultural production and in other sectors. It is evident that this is an essential step, but it is also necessary to find a formula acceptable to all, a balanced plan which will avoid penalizing some without burdening others with the cost of the reduction.

This having been said, it is also necessary to observe that the 'Europe of waste', Mr Chancellor, exists not only in the Community budget; it exists in the national budgets as well, in the national incentives, in the national financial and industrial policies, without any European dimension.

In my opinion, there is no contradiction between increasing the Community's own resources and exercising rigorous budgetary control on the national level; on the contrary, Community expenditure is the only kind which can, in certain cases, create the 'scale economies' which could make possible a reduction in overall expenditure by public authorities in the Community and render such expenditure more effective.

What was missing in Stuttgart was the clear affirmation of definite practical decisions regarding the increase in our own resources and the development of new Community policies. A certain timidity in this regard appears in the otherwise excellent speech made by Chancellor Kohl this morning. Also missing was a clear affirmation in regard to the greater financial resources needed by the Community, to the effect that the logic of the Community's own resources cannot be denied even if it be subject to variations in revenue.

I want to emphasize, Mr Chancellor, that we have many times affirmed that increasing these resources can also be examined in relation to the needs of enlargement to include Spain and Portugal, but it is an organic Community phenomenon apart from the factor of enlargement. This needs to be better understood in order to counteract the notion that malfunctions, however justifiably pointed out, can serve as an excuse for postponing the solution of the problem of the Community's own resources.

We wanted to summarize the points which seem vital to us in a motion for a resolution intended as a compromise to be supported by all groups. It is substantially a question of finally reaching an agreement on the Europe we wish to create and the manner and timing of its creation.

Adonnino

We reject the idea of an 'episodic' Europe, accepted up to now, and we hope for a coherent and purposeful Europe. You gave the Commission a mandate to identify the policies to be carried out on a priority basis insofar as they coincide with Community objectives, but it should be added that this should be done not only with an eye to savings and greater efficiency but also and especially with an eye to promoting the integration of the economic policies of the Member States.

Economic Europe should therefore be strengthened by this process, for it is an illusion to believe that a political Europe can be built without the support of an economic Europe. In order to do this, we believe that a proper understanding of balanced universal participation demands both a financial and an economic contribution.

I much appreciated the remarks made by Chancellor Kohl in a recent speech in his own country. While stressing Germany's substantial financial contribution to the Community, he also dwelt on the advantages deriving from the acquisition of vast European markets.

The European Council reached a decision on the recurring problem of Great Britain. Parliament will study this decision. We are sure that it follows Parliament's guidelines. I would like to make clear, however, that any solution should be accompanied by a specific commitment regarding the increase in the Community's own resources and Community development.

I conclude, Mr President, by observing that the Council of Stuttgart rightly indicated Parliament as the institution to take a leading rôle in the choice of the path subsequently to be taken. It is necessary, however, for Parliament to be given facilities equal to those of the Council that is, it should be provided with all the documentation available to the Council itself, including the internal and service documents, so that it can perform its proper function in the construction of Europe.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Balfour (ED). — Mr President, unlike most of those who have spoken in this debate before me, I did not expect any miracles from Stuttgart. Indeed, in many ways I consider the fact that a crisis was avoided, a major achievement in itself. Perhaps there are some who would have preferred a crisis. For my part, I am delighted it was averted. It was averted by the determination and the enormous authority of the German presidency and the willingness of others to compromise. Instead we have emerged from Stuttgart with a reinforcement of the underlying political commitment to European Union, with a recognition of the fundamental institutional structure of the Community and with a formal acceptance that our budget is not just the plaything of the Council but the joint responsibility of the Council and Parliament.

This was our constitutional victory: that the Council has not tried to decide the issue for us. They have agreed an amount which they consider fair and now it is up to Parliament to decide if the road ahead on future financing has come sufficiently into view for us to ratify this agreement. So you see, Mr Bangemann, wherever you are, that your friend Henry Plumb and his humble colleagues appreciate the constitutional significance of what happened in Stuttgart. There is no need for Mr Bangemann to remind us that the issue of the rebate is still to be decided through the 1984 budget procedure.

The Federal Chancellor admonished us for saying one thing here in this House and something else back home. He is right. As Mr Arndt so cunningly pointed out there are certain German Members of this House — dare I say, CDU Members of this House — who take a rather different view, especially on agricultural spending, from that of their distinguished government back home.

He is also right that there is a certain Conservative government, which shall remain nameless, which does not always take its lead from the European Democratic Group. This, of course, is something I regret. But I can assure him that we leave few stones unturned to put our case as Conservative MEPs to our Conservative Ministers and colleagues back home. We recognize — and our Government colleagues in London recognize — that the UK rebate can only be decided through *our* budget and through *our* votes in this Chamber. We recognize too that this Parliament has given fair warning, as paragraph 5 of Mr Arndt's resolution of 18 May has done, that we must have at least a clear conception of how the Community is to be financed in the future before we will be prepared to ratify the agreement so painfully arrived at in Stuttgart.

We now wait patiently for the outcome of the Athens Summit. We have shown how and on what conditions we should move forward with new own resources. We have made our contribution and we now await decisive action from our colleagues in government.

Now let me turn to the UK rebate — a subject so desperately misunderstood by Mr Louwes and Mr Lalor. It would have been greatly welcomed on this side of the House, had a clear conception already emerged of our financing arrangements for the future. It is no fun having to turn somersaults each year in order to achieve a limited element of financial equalization. What is undoubtedly true is that our present fiscal system is unjust. It is fundamentally unjust because it imposes an unjustifiable financial strain on one of the Community's less wealthy group of taxpayers. I do not speak of Member States. I speak of European taxpayers. The Community citizens and taxpayers whom I have the privilege of representing in this House accept that they must continue to receive less in financial terms than their relative lack

Balfour

of prosperity should entitle them to. As Sir Henry Plumb has said before me, our electors do not seek a profit. They seek no more than a just contribution. They want to end the unjustifiable profit of others, like my good friends Louwes and Lalor.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we have listened with care to Mr Genscher's smug and artfully formulated account, and to the praises of Mr Thorn and other speakers.

The feeling of the Members of the Greek Communist Party is that nothing positive at all was achieved by the German presidency for working people in the EEC, nothing constructive to avert the danger that threatens Europe with becoming the theatre of a nuclear holocaust. Because the time available to me is limited, I would like to justify this view of ours by mentioning just a few facts and figures. At the beginning of the German presidency. Mr Genscher projected as one of the main targets of his period in office the fight against the tragic situation of the unemployed in Europe. However, in the six months since then, far from being reduced, unemployment has increased. Still worse, there has been an attempt to reinforce the policy of one-sided frugality, to make permanent and institutionalize underemployment by measures such as temporary employment, the undermining of automatic index-linking of wages, the restriction of social and welfare provision, reaching a peak with the farce of the extra part-session, supposedly for the purpose of dealing with unemployment, last April in Brussels.

On the other hand, Mr Genscher promised that American competition in the sector of interest rates etc. would be dealt with, but they went to Williamsburg and came back with a ratification of the decision to develop Pershing and Cruise in Europe, to maintain and to increase military expenditure, so that the working people of Europe might subsidize the American budgetary deficits created by the maniacal arms race pursued by the Reagan administration.

Finally, throughout the period before Stuttgart Mr Genscher was striving for, and had expected to achieve a triumph by, the signing of the European Act. He failed, and obtained only a simple declaration, but this simple declaration nevertheless has clear aims. It does not aspire to a united Europe, but to a monopolistic and imperialistic class union. This is proved by the text itself and by all the subsequent activities.

Mr President, in this deliberately festive extra part-session of our Parliament to receive the account of the German presidency, both Mr Genscher and Mr Thorn have expressed their faith in the Greek presidency. So far as we are concerned, it is with sorrow that we wish

to point out that to whatever extent the Greek government responds to this faith of Mr Genscher and Mr Thorn, to that same extent will they be contravening the pact that binds them to the Greek people and acting against the vital interests of our country and of working people not only in Greece but in the whole of Europe.

Mr Haagerup (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, when one reads the Stuttgart declaration, one cannot help noticing that several countries expressed various reservations and that Denmark is the country which attached the record number of reservations to this solemn declaration on the Community's future.

There is increasing evidence of a consistent line on the part of Denmark, Greece and to some extent Great Britain in opposing all efforts to strengthen the Community, to reduce the use of the right of veto and to give the European Parliament a somewhat more important rôle than it has had up to now.

I should like, both as spokesman for the Liberal Group and as a Dane, to express my profound regret over this restrictive attitude. It is not, as some optimistically put it, an expression of sound common sense and realism in the face of the grandiose plans of other countries for European union. Admittedly, the term European union in itself is not a particularly appropriate one to denote the efforts to strengthen the Community, and, admittedly, rather bombastic, airy and imprecise expressions are sometimes used to describe the aims of Community cooperation; but the opposition conveyed by footnotes and reservations is a reflection of inertia and immobility in European policy and, in the opinion of my group and myself personally, it is a real threat to the future of the Community.

For obvious reasons, I am well acquainted with the situation in Denmark, where a complex parliamentary situation and a deep split in the Danish Social Democratic Party on foreign policy, not least on Community policy, have the effect of paralysing the capacity for action on European policy of any Danish Government, including the present one. The blame for this is to be laid at a number of doors. The Danish EEC opponents, who are also represented here in Parliament and whom we have heard today in the person of Mr Bøgh, use thoroughly outrageous methods in their unstinting efforts to cast suspicion on the Community and to promote misleading interpretations of the consequences of Danish membership.

But that is hardly the main issue, since, after all, we are familiar with demagogues and fanatics of that kind in other areas too. It is politically more serious that the Social Democrats in Denmark, in order to maintain their position with the electorate, are pursuing a completely static policy on the European Community.

Haagerup

In this way the leadership of the Party hope to prevent a groundswell of opinion from developing which would seek to take Denmark out of the Community. But the price of this complete standstill is too high, for, because of the key position of the Social Democrats in the Danish parliamentary system, it is immobilizing any development of Danish European policy. Even the most modest attempts to strengthen European cooperation are blocked. That is why we unfortunately find Denmark among the countries which most vigorously oppose any attempt to restrict the right of veto and its use and proposals to expand the rôle of the European Parliament even slightly.

Having said that, I would also add that the parties which have a positive attitude towards the Community in Denmark, most of which are, as you know, represented in the present coalition government, in my opinion are too passive and too reticent. Both my own party — Venstre, Denmark's Liberal party — and the largest party in the coalition — Det konservative folkeparti — do too little to promote appreciation of the fact that it is in Denmark's own interests to extend European cooperation and to strengthen the Community.

Let me conclude by saying that it is the paralysis of the Community which constitutes a threat to countries such as Denmark and Greece, not the possibility or the danger, if you prefer, of a large supranational union which will act over the heads of the individual Member States. And, if the influential parties and politicians who are positive towards the Community in these countries which pursue a restrictive policy do not make a real effort to influence public opinion in a positive direction, then they are giving comfort to those who foster scepticism and are indifferent. It is the latter who, in the last instance, make it possible for the active opponents of the Community to gain a hearing for their calumnies and efforts to sow mistrust towards the Community.

Mr Romualdi (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the speeches of Minister Genscher and President Kohl on the results of the meetings at Williamsburg and Stuttgart, apart from the foreseeable description of a difficult six months which saw more proposals than accomplishments, to say no worse, come down to this: at Williamsburg, Europe was unable to summon the political strength or devise an economy policy of its own to oppose the initiatives of an over-powerful country which was thus able to ignore our arguments and continue on its chosen way — obviously believing in all good faith that this was best not only for itself, but for the West as a whole — and with those policies on security and economics Japan, too, has now associated itself.

In Stuttgart things went even worse, and Mr Kohl's good intentions are not enough to reassure us about the future. The many matters which had to be settled

were not, in fact, resolved. Nearly everything was put off until the Athens Summit, and it is more than probable — if the mentality of the Council and of the political forces represented there and in each individual country does not change — that the Athens Summit too will fail to settle anything. No doubt the usual procedure will be followed, and everything postponed until another summit is held.

The philosophy of postponement persists, and the Solemn Declaration, which is solemn in name only, confirms this. At this point it is no more than an empty document, a piece of paper exalted by much eloquence. We are not the only ones to say this: Mr Thorn himself, the President of the Commission, said it yesterday in his sad and troubled speech, where he had the somewhat belated intention of frankly pointing out the past and present failures. He finally did so, asserting that Parliament and the Commission must now join in confronting the Council with its responsibilities.

Mr Kohl said here this morning that Parliament is important and should be heard. We certainly agree with this, but the first ones to listen to Parliament should be the Council and the European Council of heads of state and government, for the Council is increasingly dominated by national demands to which it evidently feels bound to give priority. Equally apparent is the Council's growing tendency to forget its duty to strengthen the political, and thereby economic, social and moral unity of the Community, without which Europe as such and its member countries face irretrievable political doom. In view of all this, the Commission and Parliament cannot but be aware of their own responsibilities; they must unite in denouncing the failings of the Council before public opinion, and oblige this institution to identify the political forces in the individual states which compel it to betray the hope and interests of European policy.

The error into which many of our governments have fallen is that of seeing themselves not as parts of a real Community, but rather as governments associated to create or defend a free-trade zone, a more advantageous market with more manageable dimensions. Chancellor Kohl has said that this is not true, that it should not be the case, but in this half-year the idea has re-emerged stronger than ever, tempting and dangerous. For this it was not worth electing a Parliament by direct universal suffrage, calling upon hundreds of thousands of European men and women to vote, raising hopes which are now in danger of remaining unfulfilled.

In Stuttgart, the only thing that was not postponed was the date for the new elections of 1984. But what are we to vote for — for a Parliament which intends to assert itself or for an empty Chamber, for a body devoid not only of powers but also of ideas, imagination, and the desire to have either? Under these condi-

Romualdi

tions, people rightly wonder if it is worthwhile to vote. No answer was given in Stuttgart, and none will be given in Athens. But an answer there must be, and if the Council does not supply it, then Parliament must do so, with the support of the Commission, for it is untrue to say that Parliament and the Commission have done nothing. They have acted, although they were regrettably late in doing so; their initiatives have been wilfully unheeded or overlooked by the Council. The mistake made by Parliament and the Commission was perhaps in taking up too many matters, and in the important ones failing to find the energy and decisiveness necessary to make themselves heard. This is why I feel that we can provide an answer, and we will; otherwise, we shall have no valid reason to call upon our citizens to vote on the day between 14 and 17 June of next year chosen by each of our countries. This must not happen, for Europe, ladies and gentlemen, is the future, and the fears and warmed-up chauvinism we are now witnessing belong to the past.

Mrs Salisch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as rapporteur of this House on questions of youth unemployment, I must express my disappointment about the kind of decisions which were produced during the German presidency and at the Stuttgart Summit. When you, Messrs Presidents, describe the situation of the young unemployed in this Community as dramatic, I say: yes, you are right, it is dramatic. And when you say that this Community needs action to combat youth unemployment, I also agree.

But that is as far as our agreement goes. You did not really have the right either in the past six months or finally in Stuttgart, to take no decisions at all on combating youth unemployment. I know what I am saying here, for you boast of something else. In my view what you, Mr Genscher, and Mr Kohl too are practising, to put it bluntly, is in fact demagoguery, for you speak of the reform of the Social Fund as if to suggest that something decisive was now about to happen, which would give young unemployed people in Europe jobs again.

You speak of the need to adjust to requirements, saying that the problems must be tackled in a timely manner. But what is the real picture? The only thing you propose is that in future 75 % of European Social Fund resources should be allocated to combating youth unemployment — yet you know that in fact that only means a little over DM 500 per young person per month, and we all know that we need hundreds of billions of DM if we want to give all the young people in Europe jobs again!

What would it cost if we were really to create training places? You know the problems! Do you really think it is defensible to say to the public and to us again today: we have done something by informing you

that 75 % of European Social Fund resources are being allocated to combating youth unemployment?

You choose to use the word 'concentration'. That suggests something. Basically it means you are suggesting determination. But surely that is a terribly poor form of playing with words? Concentrating what little there is surely means that afterwards there will be little available. Nor did you mention that the consultation between you and Parliament on the reform of the Social Fund has not even taken place. So here you are presenting a decision which in the event has not even been taken jointly.

Parliament asked for much more. It called for a hundred per cent increase in the Social Fund's resources because it understood that the small steps which keep being taken can only awaken hopes but that in the end these hopes cannot be fulfilled, which leaves no prospects at all for unemployed young people, particularly in Europe.

Messrs Presidents, what has happened to the training and job guarantee for young people aged between 16 and 25 of which so much was said and which was constantly being cut back again? What has happened to it, Mr Genscher? Yesterday you told us: over a period of five years a voluntary commitment by the Member States to guarantee employment one year after leaving school — to take them off the streets so to speak. Is that really the prospect you can hold out for the young people of Europe you are constantly talking about? Should we not really have needed much more, in fact something that really deserves to be called a training and employment guarantee? What has happened to the programme we recommended for helping young people become independent? We have heard nothing about it, nothing at all!

You are so keen on vocational training, but do you not know that in Europe today we have the most highly-skilled young people we have ever had and yet they can find no jobs? Surely that is where the problem lies. If you had only read this House's decisions and had only considered them for a moment, you would have realized that we need a general European employment offensive, that we need shorter working time, to ensure that young people, too, can at last find work again.

You said that the utmost priority would be attached to youth unemployment. Really you were only shedding crocodile tears, which is very sad. But the most cynical of all are the Member States which lament youth unemployment but create ever more young unemployed by their economic policy.

(Cry of shame!)

It is not a question of shame; unfortunately, that is the sad truth! And it is just as sad that it did not prove possible in the past six months to take decisions

Salisch

which would have enabled the young unemployed in Europe to take hope and see real prospects before them.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, Mr Federal Chancellor, the report by the Federal Minister, Mr Genscher, on the six months of the German presidency of the Council, on which I am to speak on behalf of the European People's Party, did not unfortunately live up to all our hopes. That led the President of our Parliament, Mr Dankert, to censure the German presidency, and not for the first time. So may I put clearly on record that Mr Dankert is speaking only for himself and his companions and by no means for the majority of this Parliament.

(Applause)

On balance, regardless of Stuttgart, there are some positive aspects, in spite of the huge difficulties of the last six months, with the elections in Germany, England and Italy and the local elections in France, which all had a paralysing effect. These aspects are : the settlement of the fisheries dispute and the signs of a thaw on the questions of own resources and agricultural policy. This short list alone shows how things really stand in our Community. Things are not as bad as our illwishers assert. And, God knows, not as good as they really could be.

Mainly to blame is the Council, which has become an instrument of the most reactionary nationalism, the rearguard of the nineteenth century. Structurally impotent since our unholy Luxembourg compromise, and weakened by the shortness of its terms of presidency, nevertheless it grabs all the responsibilities for itself and thus paralyses the Community. Its chronic inability to take decisions, which reminds one of the *liberum veto* of the Polish diet, is the problem of our future, far more than the shortage of funds, which was wrestled with so much in Stuttgart. Until the omnipotence usurped by the Council has been destroyed there will be no real breakthrough on the road to Europe. This fundamental fact shows the historic achievement of Federal Chancellor Kohl, whom we have to thank for the fact that in the end some small steps forward were taken after all.

The Christian Democratic Chancellor of Germany, a worthy heir to Adenauer, and President Thorn of the Commission, were the heroes of Stuttgart. They deserve our unreserved thanks. But I also thank you, Mr Genscher, for your brave work at Mr Kohl's side. In spite of everything, Europe has become so strong

that not even the governments can destroy it. We have now gone beyond the point of no return on the road to Europe. We can no longer return to the old days. That is why the coming European election is so important. There is little time left for achievements before the electorate judges the results of the past five years of the Community. There is still much to be done. We must bring Europe closer to its citizens, for man cannot live by bread alone. We must at last get rid of the senseless, useless, pointless controls at the Community's internal frontiers in their present form. The European passport must have a meaning. For that, we need a European citizenship which all Europeans should obtain in addition to their national citizenship.

We must make the idea of the internal market a tangible one, even in such supposed details as parcel rates, which should be fixed according to the same criteria as for letters. One of the strongest arguments for Europe at this time is the threat to our environment. Only the Community can still save what remains to be saved. I come from Bavaria, a land whose government is in the vanguard of progress in environmental policy because it actually carries out the reforms which the Greens and their hangers-on only go on about. But even we can only eliminate half the pollution, for more than 50 % of the poisons come from neighbouring states. Yet our parliament has achieved a great deal here. If the national bureaucracies had not obstructed us and prevented us from enforcing our directives, we would not have seen the scandal of the fugitive barrels of Seveso poison. Now we will see what is to happen to our proposals on lead in fuel.

In institutional questions, one aspect is specially significant : unanimity or majority decisions in the Council — everything else can be settled quite easily. Here we must finally talk plainly, for the blockade of the majority by a malicious minority harms all our people !

(Applause)

Much could still be done in that area, even if it were a calculated act of daring like Sadat's flight to Jerusalem. What about resorting to attack, Mr Minister ? Enlargement southwards remains a distant objective, because two governments have still not understood what Mrs Margaret Thatcher repeated in Stuttgart, namely that priority should be attached to security policy. If we continue to waste time because of lack of resolve, it may well happen that we protect the privileges of the wine and oil producers, but that in the end foreign soldiers will harvest the fruits of our soil. As for the material effects of enlargement, we can only welcome the fact that England has moved away from its stubborn negative attitude on the question of our own resources and confirmed this in the most recent debate in the House of Commons. Today we can rightly assume that this problem, too, can be resolved with a bit of goodwill on both sides.

Habsburg

We heard a lot about saving in Stuttgart recently, and that is welcome. But may we modestly indicate a few areas where we really could economise if only the Council would finally decide? How much money is wrongly wasted by our travelling about that could be saved if we fixed a single place of work, and who is competent to decide there, if not the Council? We hear laments about the costs of agricultural policy, but who dismissed Parliament's reform proposals if not the Council? Much could be done here if people would only finally stop pursuing petty national policies to the detriment of Europe!

(Applause from the centre and right)

And this also applies to those areas where too little has happened to date for various reasons, such as cultural policy, a comprehensive regional policy and the solution or at least active consideration of social questions in the Community. Anyone who has studied the politics of recent years will realize that we are at risk and have little time. The Soviet Union, which has imposed its hegemony on thirteen former free and independent nations, including one in Europe, in the past four decades, is not about to tell us honestly that our turn will come too. History teaches us that peace in freedom can be preserved only if those who want peace are strong enough to ensure that the warmongers do not dare to attack them. For us that does not only mean weapons, important as they are, but also political integration to ensure security on the basis of adequate strength.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Beside this epoch-making task of preserving peace in freedom, how petty national vanity and alleged sovereign rights look! We should all finally resolve to think and act in consistently European terms. That would benefit our nations too.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DK)* Madam President, I listened with great interest to the speeches of Federal Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher, and I think that a constant theme of the speeches was that, in regard to the future of the Community, there is an urgent need to strengthen the attitude of the public to the Community. That is the conclusion of both Mr Genscher's and Mr Kohl's speeches yesterday and today.

But what has the Council done to promote a more positive attitude to the Community among the public? Has it really been able to instil an understanding in the individual citizens of the Member States of the fact that we are working systematically for an improvement in the conditions of each and everyone in the Community? Regrettably, I think the answer must be 'no'. Many of the esteemed speakers we have heard today have confirmed that this is the case.

When we speak of European union — and Federal Chancellor Kohl and his government at least cannot be accused of refusing to work for an improvement in conditions for the Community decision-making processes — we have to say, unfortunately, that other countries are applying the brakes. We note with concern that there are Member States which want to block the influence of the only democratic institution in the Community — the European Parliament. I note with concern that they do not even want to give the European Parliament a say in who should be the President of the Commission, for there are Member States, including my own country, which want to impose limits. It is not right, if the attitude of the individual citizen is to be strengthened, that the only institution in which he has direct influence and through which he can follow what is happening, has its influence restricted. I am therefore deeply disappointed that this question was not settled at the recent European summit in Stuttgart.

Something else I should like to draw attention to in connection with the attitude of the individual citizen to the Community is that Federal Chancellor Kohl said that the German presidency had, amongst other things, succeeded in securing the adoption of a fisheries policy. That is correct. We have managed to establish a common fisheries policy after 5-6 years of fruitless negotiations. But is it a policy which will help to strengthen the individual citizen's confidence in the Community? Is it a policy which really embodies the fundamental principles of the Community? Unfortunately, we have to note that it is not. It is a policy on which agreement has been achieved, so that the problem is solved for those who sat round the negotiating table; but it is not a policy which strengthens the rights of the individual citizen. This is a very good example of the power of national self-interest, an example of the fact that admittance to production resources depends on one's nationality. But this is not one of the fundamental principles of the Treaty of Rome. It is not one of the principles on which the Community was founded. Thus we see, when it comes down to fundamentals, when it comes down to what should guide the individual citizen in his life, that we have not the strength to implement the Community ideas.

Another matter which has been mentioned by a number of honourable Members is the question of the internal market. We have to note that there are 21 draft directives with the Council which have not been adopted, even though many citizens in all the Member States would be directly affected by their adoption, by the removal of technical barriers which have been raised by policies of national self-interest. But nothing came of that either. On 21 June, the ministers of trade and industry met, but they did not succeed in solving a single one of the problems so that we could make progress.

Kirk

Unfortunately, we have to note that, when we get down to essentials, when we get down to finding solutions to the problems affecting the individual citizen in the Community, fine words no longer apply if there is not the will to seek Community solutions, if national self-interest wins. My hope will be that the German presidency and the German Government, which I believe has a very positive attitude to the Community, as was demonstrated today, will be able to make its influence felt both in the Commission and in the Council, so that we can get rid of national self-interest and devise Community solutions for the benefit of individual citizens in all the Member States.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr. President, the German presidency has presented us with a picture of the Community's problems that disguises the acute realities. In neither of the two speeches did we find signs of any substantial concern in the face of the two subjects that dramatically dominate life in Europe, namely, unemployment and nuclear weapons. On the contrary, we found appeals for new economies and restrictions in the CAP, and we fear that in the final analysis these will mean renewed cuts in the incomes of the lower-paid.

The German presidency expressed its sorrow about the twelve-and-a-half million unemployed and mentioned that this problem was among its priorities. Likewise the Commission. But for how many years have we been listening to the same well-meaning expressions? Each presidency bequeaths to the next one an increased number of unemployed, and Heaven help us, particularly among the young and among women, with a deal of regret each time, it is true. That is unacceptable. It indicates the crisis affecting the Community, its policies and its institutions, and we are proposing that at the next meeting of the Foreign Ministers representatives from the European Confederation of Trade Unions should be invited informally to participate in a fundamental discussion of the problem. At a time when the economic crisis is becoming more profound, the European Community, bound despite the will of its peoples to the chariot of American policy, is descending deeper and deeper down the slope of escalation and an arms race in the name of a security that actually increases the dangers.

Mr Genscher, you have sung to us the praises of Williamsburg. The demonstrators at Krefeld did not share your opinion. It is all very well to call them paid agitators, but they are closer to the conscience of the European people, who look to their leadership for work, peace and autonomy. The Greek government was reproached indirectly but threateningly for its reservations at the beginning of this accord. I, of course, do not speak on its behalf. We want to see the build-up of a united Europe with a stronger voice for Parliament. We want new democratic institutions that will unite us. But show us what you mean by this union?

Is it to entail an increase in our resources, an increase in the contributions by wealthier countries to the benefit of the less well developed regions and the Mediterranean programmes? What do you have in mind? The financing of large investment programmes designed to combat unemployment, to restrict the predatory immunity of the multinationals? Otherwise, dissent is the only weapon of the weak and of the small, not for the purpose of blocking progress, Mr Genscher, but in order to direct it along the right lines, i.e. in a direction that will serve the interests of the Community's working people.

We hope that the Greek presidency will give a new impetus to the search for, and implementation of, solutions that will promote an effective European policy to the benefit of our common aims.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to start by paying tribute to the German presidency. The closest attention was paid to the ideas that Mr Genscher put before us yesterday and also to what Chancellor Kohl told us this morning about the results of Stuttgart. We indicated our preferences and guidelines in a resolution, of course, but we ultimately withdrew it after trying to do what was possible in a common text that ultimately did not meet with our satisfaction. For the truth of the matter is that we still wish to work for the future of Europe and for European union.

At this stage, however, we are forced to admit that there is still a considerable amount of uncertainty about the future and the development of Europe. We have, for example, some fears for the future of the common agricultural policy, which is, after all, the keystone of the construction of Europe so far. It would be unacceptable to me and to our group to use reorganization and financial stringency as a pretext for damaging the only real common policy to date. And it would be particularly unacceptable, in a period of high unemployment, if a reduction in the funds channelled into the CAP were to send thousands of small farmers to join the already overcrowded ranks of the unemployed. If there is overproduction in a certain sector, then the real causes have to be dealt with.

With surplus production, it is particularly urgent to reestablish the Community preference, which is one of the basic principles of the CAP, as we all too often tend to forget. Before cutting CAP funds, we should also revive the first of these basic principles — unity of price and of market — via the total, permanent suppression of compensatory amounts. However, we do understand those who are interested in improving this common agricultural policy and making it more efficient. As far as we are concerned, Mr Chancellor, Stuttgart was not a satisfactory finishing post. It was a starting point for a stronger Europe that is confident of its destiny, for, as you said, Europe and not a return

Coûté

to national egoism is the only viable and realistic way for us. This, in fact, is what Jacques Chirac meant in the speech he made on 12 June in Paris recently, and it is something we support.

Greater own resources is not an answer in itself, let us not forget. It is simply one possible way of pursuing the common policies better and of embarking on new ones. We don't want to see a Europe that is only in low gear. We want it to be active and united, a Europe where the idea of *juste retour* is not important. Certainly, we think that a sound method was decided on at Stuttgart, whereby all decisions are to be global decisions arrived at through Councils of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Economy and Finance — and, if necessary, Agriculture too. In a word, we are satisfied with reaching or trying to reach Community solutions with Community procedures.

This global approach to problems, we feel, is a good solution, because the Council has so far always failed to come up with separate solutions — which are, ultimately, all too often contradictory when implemented. This is also the only way of dissolving national egoism in the sort of Community solidarity which has to develop and relaunch Europe. We certainly need more Europe, as we so often hear in our streets and villages, if the citizens of Europe are to realize it exists. And this Europe has to move in the right direction. That is to say, it has to unite its means of production and ensure free movement of individuals and of all economic means, including capital, so that it can have an external food aid strategy, for example, for we all know that there is considerable want in the world today and there are people dying of hunger. And within the Community we must pursue an industrial policy of research and development. It is because Europe is united that it can act in the world today.

(Applause from the right).

Mr Saby (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although the Stuttgart summit was dominated by the British contribution — and we are sorry about this — some fundamental issues were still discussed. And it would be reasonable to say that a Messina-type process was begun, which should enable us to define the prospects of European development in the future.

The urgency and interdependence of the problems was underlined. I should like to insist on the indisputable, and I should say irreversible, link between the problem of the contribution, European recovery and the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. This should be consolidated at Athens — and as quickly as possible. We intend to get positive results in December. This is in fact what the Bureau of our group told the Spanish authorities in Madrid early in the week. The Socialist Group feels that it has achieved something at last on this point. As

our chairman, Mr Glinne said just now, there can be no genuine policy of recovery unless there is a clear, coherent and willingly accepted financial basis. And we hope that this House will devote a plenary part-session to this subject — which could be introduced by the Jaquet resolution — before December. For there can be no social, industrial or agricultural policy and no policy of research and innovation without a discussion of essentials on the basis of a sound budgetary system.

Lastly, enlargement to bring in Spain and Portugal has reached the practical stage. What happened at Stuttgart is important, because instead of a date that we shift if we feel like it, we have now achieved something solid, and I should say to our friends in Spain and Portugal that we are on the right road and things should now move fairly fast. That is only a first step. It has to be realized that, unless we have a clear financial policy and a clear idea of the future financing of the Community, and unless we have solidarity among our Member States, either we find solutions — Europe will start up again with concrete proposals in Athens in December and then the problems of enlargement to include Spain and Portugal will be taken into account — or there will be no more Community. Today the Stuttgart summit has started on these questions of substance. And I should like to say here that the Socialist Group will help to find solutions to the problem of future financing and its related problems and do its best to achieve the revitalization of Europe we talk so much about, something which we are all awaiting and which must, ultimately, occur.

Mr Herman (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, like many of my colleagues, I should like to pay tribute to the German Presidency for the work it so happily put in to avoid Stuttgart being a failure. In addition to the meagre results and the postponing of decisions that, in view of the crisis, could not be more urgent, there are three things troubling us.

First is the manifest tendency to drift away from the Community procedures laid down in the treaties. The European Council has asked the Council of Ministers to meet on an intensive basis and in what could be an unusual form — which does not bother us — to submit proposals for approval in Athens. But what happens to the Commission's in principle exclusive right and role of initiative?

The role of the Commission and its proposals are of course mentioned, very discreetly, as it happens. But they are put on the same footing as documents from any of the governments. This is not just unacceptable. It is, above all, inefficient.

And since we are talking about the budget and financing, what has happened to the second arm of the budgetary authority, the European Parliament, which is the only body able to provide democratic

Herman

control over what the European institutions do with the European citizens' money? The national parliaments no longer control own resources. We are the only ones able to do that. But not a word on this subject was heard in Stuttgart.

The second thing causing us concern is the underlying conviction (reiterated this morning) in the Council that, as the national budgets are showing a deficit, the European budget ought to have help too. If the Community's policies and spending cannot achieve more cheaply and more efficiently the aims which national policies were able to reach before, then the EEC ought to be dissolved, Parliament ought to be dissolved and the Commission ought to be dissolved. If, on the other hand, certain targets can be achieved better by the Ten than by the individual countries, then the only way to reduce the pressure of taxation (which is too high everywhere) on our national economies is to boost Community policies, and Community spending therefore, by cutting back on national policies and national spending.

Our third cause for concern stems from the declarations made to the press while the Council was going on. People who say ostentatiously and even with a certain amount of jubilation that they are against any supranational conception of European construction are not only misunderstanding the spirit and the letter of a treaty that was signed with some solemnity. They are adding cynicism to denial. Rubber-stamping the principle of the unanimous vote is failing to realize that there is a common European interest that is something more than and different from the sum of the national interests.

Declarations like those we heard force us to raise this serious question. Has not the time come to consider that the construction of Europe, the only revolutionary and positive idea of the 20th century, can only be pursued by those who believe in it and who are willing to accept the sacrifices and not to count the cost but are certain that, in the end, the venture will bear fruit? Anyone can change his mind. But those who have abandoned this ideal have no right to prevent the people of Europe from believing in their future and from obtaining the means of building it.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Paisley (NI). — Madam President, I must register my protest against the holding of this special part-session just because no agreement could be arrived at between the out-going German Presidency and the in-coming Greek Presidency. This is a disgraceful waste of money — money which we are told is very scarce in the Community. Surely no statements ever made in an elected assembly cost so much money as the statements this Parliament has been re-convened to hear at this special part-session.

Having said that I want to congratulate the German Presidency on the allocation of money for the Belfast integration scheme and the very important fact that this money will be additional. I most heartily welcome the fact that the principle of the additionality for this money is thus established and will in the future be safeguarded and maintained. Northern Ireland, with the worst unemployment in the Community, the highest energy and transport costs as well as the blight of IRA terrorism, urgently requires this help.

I would also like to congratulate the German Presidency under whose auspices Northern Ireland secured 50 000 tonnes of intervention wheat which will be a help to the intensive sector of our agricultural industry.

It ill becomes Mr Lalor to complain against the United Kingdom when his country is receiving 1 million a day from the EEC — vastly more than his country pays in to the Community.

Finally, I regret that under the German Presidency no progress has been made on the vexed question of extradition. This question is vital to the survival of the people I represent in this House.

Mrs Gredal (S). — *(DA)* Madam President, to begin with I should like to state clearly that Danish Social-Democrats have said 'yes' to the European Community — a 'yes' which, as everyone knows, carries certain qualifications, and one of these qualifications is a 'yes' to political union. We have said 'yes' to an economic Community and to cooperation, and the Danish parties which voted in favour of the European Community took the same view. It is worth noting that, when Denmark in the person of a Conservative minister recorded reservations in Stuttgart on a number of issues, this had the backing of a large majority in the Danish Folketing and was not motivated by the wishes of the Danish Social-Democrats alone. It is also a clear move forward in the position of the Social-Democratic government with regard to the Community.

When the Genscher-Colombo plan came before us for the first time, there was no attempt on the part of Denmark to hide the fact that the content of the plan did not bear much relation to our expectations of Community cooperation. Denmark has stated reservations, Denmark is negative towards the Community — that is how it is interpreted. That is not correct. We are not negative, but we are pragmatic people who think that the Community should be used for practical purposes, that the cooperation should produce results which the citizens of Europe can also see and understand. The Community will be and should be judged by its results, and it is our view that the possibilities for the Community within the framework of the existing treaties have not by any means been exhausted.

Gredal

I should like to ask a question: what do you think ordinary people understand by the Genscher-Colombo plan? What does it have to offer them? In our opinion, nothing. It is only for those on the inside, people who are concerned with Community questions on a day-to-day basis, it is in fact a stream of words without any clear content.

There is a tendency in certain quarters to underestimate the Danish reservations, and I would repeat what the Danish Social-Democrats meant right from the start by these reservations. We want to make use of the Luxembourg compromise, we want to use our veto in these areas if proposals should be put forward in them. This was also stressed by the present Conservative Prime Minister of Denmark after the Stuttgart meeting. But I also wish to express great satisfaction at what the President of the European Council, Mr Kohl, said today about coming to terms with the fact that some Member States are unable to accept parts of the declaration of intent and at his assurance that the right of veto still exists. I note that Mr Kohl said that proposals should not be put forward here in Parliament which are not acceptable at home. That is the way we Danish Social-Democrats try to work here, and I think that Mr Haagerup should have been clear about that before he spoke. Mr Haagerup's attempt here to blame the Danish Prime Minister's reservations in Stuttgart on the Danish Social-Democrats is quite fantastic.

I would point out one single fact. Mr Haagerup should remember that, when the present government took office, the Prime Minister declared that the right of veto would be maintained; there is no doubt of that.

And he said it without pressure from any party. Deep inside Mr Haagerup's own party there are also such voices. It is not something the Danish Social-Democrats need to accuse anyone of, it is their own conviction. Mr Haagerup's party would be more credible if it pursued the same policy here in Parliament as at home in Denmark.

Let me finally put a question to Mr Genscher. Does he speak as President of the Council or as German Foreign Minister when he makes pronouncements — which, by the way, can only be interpreted as threats — to the effect that countries which have sought qualifications in the wording of the declaration — and I would point out that it was not only Denmark which sought to qualify the declaration — should leave the Community? I can hardly believe that it was the President of the Council who was speaking. He, after all, can only speak on behalf of the Council as a whole. I would very much like to have an answer.

Mr J. Moreau (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, president follows president, ministers

meet and major European summits give us hope. But it is soon lost. We are witnessing a decline — and this is not due to any particular presidency — and increasingly large sections of the population are becoming skeptical. People are beginning to doubt Europe's ability to solve the problems with which we and our countries have to contend.

We all have the feeling that things cannot go on as they are if we still believe, as we heard this morning, in the need for and the ineluctable nature of the construction of Europe. We have to act fast if we are to provide an effective response, as several speakers have said, to the expectations of our young people and our unemployed. If we are to do this, much more is called for than what was decided at Stuttgart, even if the procedure devised does enable some progress to be made on certain issues.

We need clarification and I, for one, am astonished, when I read the report of the Stuttgart Council, to see the list of problems discussed, as most of them should have been handled in the ordinary Councils of Ministers. This is a real misuse of procedure, and the development is a dangerous one because, in fact, it blocks the whole of the Community's decision-making process and diverts the European Council from its true nature and its true purpose.

Having said that, I should now like to look at the economic problems, particularly of the internal market. Our central aim, which is increasingly shared, is to improve the employment situation — which means increasing the competitiveness of European firms and developing common policies and schemes in the sensitive sectors.

We believe in the need for optimal functioning of the internal market, to make for the flourishing economic industrial environment our European firms need. And we believe in the need for a relaunching of balanced growth. Has significant progress been notched up over the past six months? The situation is not a negative one on balance. But there is a long way between the promises and the reality of today. We realize that an effort has been made and that certain important texts have been adopted, but we have not had the real unblocking of the situation that we were hoping for.

We know why, but we also know that all dossiers cannot and do not proceed at the same rate. This is the case, particularly, with the new instrument of commercial policy. However, we must go very much further and, above all, we must go faster. The Community certification problem must be solved in the best interests of all the Member States, and we all realize that this matter has to be discussed in relation to the previous subject, the common commercial policy.

Moreau

The texts adopted at these recent meetings have not, as I just indicated, been totally satisfactory. Everything has to be done to see that the Council speeds up the adoption of outstanding directives. The European Parliament is taking and should continue to take more initiative when it comes to alerting public opinion and the governments about the importance of the internal market. The agreements in principle that were arrived at in Stuttgart must take practical shape, and during forthcoming presidencies there must be a drive to make the movement of goods and individuals easier and bring the Community nearer to its economic agents and, above all, I was about to say, to its citizens. Any progress we make towards a real single market is a positive contribution to the establishment of the genuine Community policies to which various of my colleagues have referred and should make for easier cooperation and coordination of the policies. Such cooperation and coordination should really make it possible to give the vital 'extra' to the action of the different Member States.

That, Madam President, is all I wanted to say following the two reports we heard yesterday and today. I believe that, as long as Europe is compartmentalized, it will never interest the people as a whole. But we know that the fast action that was mentioned this morning can only occur if the people of Europe are interested and feel that Europe is their affair first and foremost.

(Applause)

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, I will begin by saying something positive. The Socialists welcome those who have come here today to hear this debate. I am glad that the European Council discussed the situation in Central America. The Socialist Group sent a telegram a week before the European Council's meeting in Stuttgart urging it to support the Contadora initiative, and it did so.

We felt this support was so necessary because we are convinced — and the European Parliament as a whole has also endorsed this view — that the will to arrive at a political solution must exist if there is to be any hope of overcoming the impasse in this area due to the violence which is causing fresh casualties every day.

We are glad that the European Council opposed any foreign interference in this area, but now that we have heard various interpretations of this decision, we wonder whether there might not be one or more snakes in the grass here. I should like a few more details from the Presidency. What exactly does 'no foreign interference' mean? Does it mean literally what it says: 'no foreign interference'? Does it really mean that every country in this region has the right to take its own, sovereign decisions on the policy it wishes to pursue? Does that mean in practical terms

that help from other countries may consist solely of help in the form of mediation and that no military assistance may be given? I should like to hear a little more about this.

Unfortunately, after being so positive, I must now join those who have criticized the events in Stuttgart. Mr Bangemann asked this morning if we had been so naive as to allow ourselves to be guided by hope before the Stuttgart summit. Well, to be honest, Madam President, when I was listening to Mr Thorn yesterday, I did not allow myself to be guided by hope. I was reminded of the statement he made here on 8 February 1983 when presenting the Commission's annual programme. On that occasion he made a number of remarkable comments. Unfortunately, I am not able to quote them all today, but I will give you a few of them, particularly in the light of what we are discussing here today.

For example, Commissioner Thorn said on that occasion — and I quote: 'All the actions proposed therefore represent a bare minimum.' He also said: 'The European Council meeting in June will be able to note the results achieved and perhaps remove some of the obstacles.' And again: 'The Commission is entitled to a response to its proposals in June'. That was really saying something, Madam President. Here we had a Commission President who was no longer prepared to accept any of the blame for the failure of a Council policy. That was music to the ears of us parliamentarians. But yesterday there was little left of this firm stance. Anyone who was expecting a Commissioner who in February asked Parliament for its support for so firm a stance, to come to Parliament and explain the implications of the failure of the European Council meeting in Stuttgart for the Commission, will have again been disappointed, but by the Commission this time. President Thorn had nothing to say about his firmness in February in any language, including his own. The man who issued something like an ultimatum in February, before the Stuttgart summit, now says: 'I warned you before the Stuttgart summit that we could not expect too much'. But then, suddenly, we have a few firm words again: 'The Commission will not allow anyone to shirk his duties'.

I wonder, after what has happened, what this all means in practice. I believe that this time the Commission should bare its teeth and show that it means to use them, or is it again going to change into a nice little dog, wagging its tail and eating out of the Council's hand, if the governments again fail? And how will Parliament react then? Will Mr Bangemann then again waste no time in giving the dog a piece of sausage, saying: Well done, Rover, good boy! Or, if the need unfortunately arises, will Parliament really find it in itself to do what the Commission again appealed for yesterday? I hope so, because only then can we hope to be taken seriously by the electorate next year.

(Applause)

Mr Genscher, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the presidency would like to begin by thanking this House for the constructive and intensive discussion of our reports of activities. We see it as reflecting the European Parliament's intention to make progress in European affairs by a constructive dialogue with the Council. Those who objected to this debate being held today were surely not addressing their criticism to the presidency, for we would have been prepared to appear before this House at another time too.

(Applause)

We had only one desire: to report to his House and to account to it. The date was decided solely by the European Parliament, and we would have had no objection even to speaking here during the Greek presidency, for in our view, handing over the presidency does not mean retiring from Europe; the responsibility continues.

(Applause)

Even if our term of presidency is coming to an end today, may I tell you at once that you will have to reckon with our presence here in the decisive months to come too. My colleague Mr Colombo and I were glad to find that when we presented and introduced our draft for a European act, we had an opportunity to speak before the House although at the time neither Italy nor the Federal Republic of Germany was heading the Council of Ministers. At the time we appreciated this for it set a good example for giving the Member States, through their governments, a say in the current, on-going debate. I would welcome it if in future too we could make this Parliament a forum for our criticism of the conduct of other governments in the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

Now I would like to turn to some of the views put forward in the debate. I specifically welcome the fact that on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Arndt rejected any 'money-grabbing attitude'! There the honourable Member's view fully coincides with that of the presidency and of the Federal Republic. I would be glad if you could also manage to remove the 'pay-master mentality' in your own party, which has unfortunately burdened and complicated the debate on European policy in the Federal Republic of Germany for a long time.

The Federal Chancellor, like myself, referred to the very serious problem of unemployment, especially youth unemployment. I must point out here that no common endeavour on the part of the European Community could rectify the mistakes of national economic policy. If it is true that our current economic problems are also — I am saying *also*, for there are other *structural* trends — the sum of the mistakes made in the Member States, then it is also

true that it will only be possible to overcome the economic crisis with the sum of *correct* economic and financial policy decisions.

(Applause)

A colleague from the Socialist Group — Mrs Salisch — said that we would need hundreds of billions just to combat youth unemployment; I can only say to you that anyone who bandies about figures like hundreds of billions — I do not know whether you mean ECUs or DM — will certainly not help to achieve the sound management of our national budgets but would be preaching the kind of financial policy that is one of the causes of our employment problems today.

(Applause)

That is why what was determined in the European Council in Stuttgart — namely the enforcement of strict budgetary discipline — is not a misconceived policy of economies but an economically and financially correct policy aimed at the effective utilization of the limited resources available. At the same time it is a policy designed to make the increase in own resources, which was also determined in principle in Stuttgart, politically feasible in the individual Member States. That is the same position the presidency repeatedly upheld in the preparatory work for the Stuttgart Summit.

So we will all have to muster the strength to decide on the necessary economies which are essential to the achievement of budgetary discipline, even against the opposition of certain groups which exist in all the Member States, so as to ensure that a sound Community financial policy, hand in hand with a sound financial policy, can, we hope, give *all* the Member States positive incentives for economic development. That means the party families must also succeed politically in their own countries with the urgently necessary reform of agricultural policy. One can take the easy way if one member of a family of parties calls for this reform, while another who bears government responsibility in another country perhaps puts the brakes on. One should not try to pass on the blame to others; I expect the political discussion to be held not just here in Parliament but to see the members struggle openly to create the right attitude in their home countries too.

(Applause)

If we undertake to do this jointly then we will also overcome the problems which we all — some here, others elsewhere — surely have in our party families, and you know exactly what I mean by this.

It has rightly been lamented that we were not able to make the progress we hoped for in the decision-making area. The Federal Chancellor said here that the Federal Government would have liked to go

Genscher

further. Please remember what I said yesterday: the future of the European Community will also depend on whether we can jointly muster the strength to make real use of the possibilities for further development referred to in the Solemn Declaration, whether we make use of the possibility of reviewing it in order to improve on it. I think we should also take the electoral campaign for the second direct election of the European Parliament as an opportunity to make the questions that must be asked on this matter into a theme of that campaign. And there is one thing you may assume here: during that campaign those candidates who represent the government parties in the Federal Republic of Germany will not say anything other than what the members of the Federal Government say with full conviction. If that can be done in all the Member States, we will achieve the progress so keenly desired by all of us after the next European election.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, during its presidency, the Federal Government would have liked to see a date set for the conclusion of the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal in the Stuttgart final document. But we regard it as important — and here I would like to refer to what the Federal Chancellor said — that by linking the ratification of the accession negotiations with the other measures and decisions urgently desired by other Member States, considerable pressure will be put on all concerned to reach a decision. I was able to express my confidence in this in the talks with my Portuguese and Spanish colleagues, for we feel committed during the presidency and also afterwards not to destroy the trust which the democrats in these two states have placed in a democratic Europe.

The European Community sees itself as a community with common values. One speaker today referred to Pershing 2, to military spending, to a class-based community of imperialists. I would like to say to the honourable Member: I am firmly convinced that with all its faults, with all its problems, this European Community is the hope of all Europeans, even outside the European Community, except where the slogan 'workers rights' is written in large letters while the actual rights are minimal.

(Loud applause)

That is why for us this European Community is more than an economic community, more than a bank counter. That is why for us this European Community is the place where we jointly shape our future; it is the hope of all Europeans in the Community and of the democracies outside the Community, and especially of countries where the people have to do without the rights which are regarded as a matter of course by democrats. That is also why this Commu-

nity must always represent its values on a worldwide basis. That is why we express our views on the problems in Argentina, in Africa and in other parts of the world.

Today, on 30 June, we are holding this debate at a time when East-West relations have entered a decisive phase. Two days ago, the Warsaw Pact summit conference in Moscow concluded with a communiqué which, besides repeating familiar ideas, also indicates that the negotiations could lead to results and which, above all, does not slam the door on any issue. What we must do now is jointly and steadfastly to realize the arms control and disarmament objectives which the Western Alliance and the European Community set out with a view to ensuring peace in Europe and reducing the tensions. That is the most broadly-based negotiating offer ever made in East-West relations.

During these days, we might even say hours, we are looking with great expectations to Madrid where it will and must be decided whether all the states involved will agree to the Spanish prime minister's offer to mediate. Since the Moscow communiqué, we have hopes and prospects here too; and I think all the Europeans in East and West are looking ahead to these decisions with high hopes, to the time when it will prove possible to secure and strengthen peace in Europe by continuing to work steadfastly for détente and disarmament, when this Europe speaks together and with one voice, when this Europe can prove itself the hope not only for fundamental democratic freedoms but also for the protection of peace on our continent and worldwide. That is why the decisions we have to take are so significant. To strengthen Europe internally, to achieve social justice, to make progress possible and to make this Europe able to take political action — that must be our common concern.

The German presidency, which is taking its leave today, thanks you for your co-operation and promises you that when our presidency has come to an end, we shall continue to act in awareness of our responsibility for Europe.

(Loud applause)

President. — Thank you Mr Genscher. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank Chancellor Kohl for coming here today and speaking to the House, and also you, Mr Genscher, for the constant courtesy you have shown this House during your Presidency by coming to answer questions so thoroughly during Question Time. We appreciate the courtesy that both you and Chancellor Kohl have shown this House by sitting through the whole of this debate and listening to everybody's speeches.

(Applause)

The reaction of the House confirms the pleasure your presence here today has given us.

The debate is closed.

President

I wish to inform the House that amendments have been tabled to the resolutions winding up this debate. As the amendments have only very recently been tabled in all languages, I would propose that we take the vote at 1.30 p.m. in accordance with the agenda. If on the contrary the House wishes to vote straight away, could I have a proposal to that effect from the floor.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Madam President, I should still like to emphasize the fact that there has been practically no opportunity of submitting for the approval of our respective groups the joint text we came up with after discussions last night and very early this morning. I should like us to vote on this document in as representative a manner as possible, so it would be reasonable for the political groups to look at what is involved for a quarter of an hour.

President. — Mr Glinne, in view of your statement, I must declare that we shall follow the times indicated in the agenda. The sitting is suspended until 1.30 p.m. when the vote will take place.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 1.30 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

3. *Votes*¹

AMENDMENTS NOS 1 AND 8 BY MR GLINNE, MR BARBI, MR HABSBURG, LADY ELLES, MR SPINELLI, MR HAAGERUP AND MR COUSTÉ

Mrs Nielsen (L). — (DA) Mr President, I draw your attention to paragraph 1 in the joint text, in which there must be a translation error, because it says that we deeply deplore that it has not been possible to find 'valid solutions' (gyldige løsninger). I refer to the word

'valid' (gyldig) — I assume it means that it has not been possible to find suitable solutions. I ask that this be corrected.

President. — Which paragraph, Mrs Nielsen?

Mrs Nielsen (L). — (DA) Paragraph 1.

President. — The French text refers to '*solutions significatives a la crise*'.

We shall correct the Danish text accordingly.

Mr Forth (ED). — Mr President, could you assure me that we have had these texts in English? Can I now go to my pigeon-hole and get it in English before I vote?

President. — Yes, Mr Forth, it is available. You may get it from your pigeon-hole.

We shall wait therefore until all the Members have got a copy of the document.

Mr Rogers (S). — Mr President, I do not know whether it has been requested — I may have missed it, but was there a request to vote on this resolution paragraph by paragraph?

President. — Yes, I have received such a request. We shall vote paragraph by paragraph. On the motion for a resolution as a whole I have received a request from the Socialist Group for a roll-call vote.

4. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament²

(The sitting was closed at 1.40 p.m.)

¹ See Annex

² Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Deadline for tabling amendments — Dates of next part-session: see Minutes

*ANNEX**Votes*

The Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the texts of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION 'EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING IN STUTTGART'

- WELSH (Doc. 1-496/83)
- GLINNE (Doc. 1-497/83)
- von WOGAU (Doc. 1-498/83)
- BARBI (Doc. 1-499/83)
- LANGES (Doc. 1-500/83)
- de la MALENE (Doc. 1-503/83)¹

replaced by

AMENDMENTS NOS 1 AND 8 WHICH WERE ADOPTED.

Explanations of vote

Mr Maher (L). — Since I have little time, I do want to make a brief comment on the references made by Mr Kohl and Mr Genscher and by Members of this Parliament which might lead us to think that there are vast savings to be made in the agricultural policy and that these savings can be used to finance other policies.

(Cries)

If there are, how much is it? We want to know how much it is. If it is a lot, who is going to pay?

President. — Mr Maher, you may not put questions, you may only give an explanation of vote.

Mr Maher (L). — Will the countries who suffer as a result introduce national aids in order to make up the losses? If that is the case, what happens to the CAP?

I think these questions should be answered. In spite of that, I am prepared to support the motion, because I feel it is important that the Heads of Government try to move this Community along in spite of the opposition from Britain, if I might say so. The United Kingdom's statements about favouring the Community would be much more credible if it were to help us to have a more integrated monetary policy by joining the EMS. This would show there was a real resolve to help the European Community.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, I protest at the way in which you are conducting these proceedings. If I remember rightly, it was agreed in the Bureau that this debate would take place in accordance with the urgency procedure, which means that no explanations of vote may be given at the time of the voting. Nor do I consider what has

¹ This motion for a resolution was withdrawn before the vote on Amendments Nos 1 and 8.

just been said to be an explanation of vote. As I intend to abide by the rules of this Parliament, I did not ask for the floor to give an explanation of vote, and I should therefore be grateful if you would declare the so-called explanation of vote that has just been given out of order.

President. — Mrs van den Heuvel, I am conducting the debates according to the guidelines, received from the sittings service and I do not see any reference to an urgent debate.

With regard to your remark on explanations of vote, I too find that some Members go off on a tangent before giving their explanation of vote as such. One should not put questions or make speeches but give the reasons why one is voting for or against or abstaining. I hope that this is what Mr Baillot will do now.

Mr Baillot (COM). — (*FR*) The text before us is intended to be an ecumenical one. But let us recognize the fact that it does not reflect the discussion we took part in this morning. What we in fact heard were contradictory speeches, and although some of the contradictions were expressed clearly, others were hinted at or implied by deliberate omissions — which were no less effective. The French Communists and Allies do not wish their vote to help maintain the confusion which the text, to their mind, involves. For this reason, and because they agree with the first paragraph in the motion for a resolution stressing the serious problem of unemployment, which they voted for, the French Communists and Allies will be abstaining.

Mr Nyborg (DEP) (*in writing*). — (*DA*) There were firm intentions that progress should be made in the establishment of the common internal market when the German presidency came into office. There was much evidence to demonstrate this in the first months of the year. Now we note that these intentions have not held firm in all respects. The results are not impressive. There are even those who will say that the German presidency can best be described by the old proverb, 'the higher you go, the harder you fall'.

However, we should not pass such harsh judgment on the German presidency in the last half year. We should be wrong to blame the Germans. It must be recognized on this occasion that other Member States, much more than Germany, have been busy feathering their own nests.

Let us look at a few facts. When the German presidency took office, it was a fact that nothing had happened regarding the internal market during the period 1979 to 1982. With Germany in charge, we saw for the first time that special Council meetings were held concerning the establishment of the internal market. A significant advance. The Germans have thus pressed for this subject to be given higher priority, but there was not the will to secure the necessary compromises. It may be Germany's fault, but it may just as well be the fault of other Member States. Nobody let the others know what his game was.

Because the problems of the internal market were brought into focus, it was nevertheless possible to cut through to the real issues. That in itself is a good thing, because the next step can then be to get to grips with mapping out some possible solutions to the problems which are blocking progress. Now we know the real internal conflicts. We know the ideological conflicts. What we want now is to get the problems solved.

One thing is certain: we must make European industry more competitive. As has been said time and time again in this House, we must build up a stable homogeneous home market in Europe, so that Europe's industries have a solid base from which to operate.

The home market is alpha and omega. It is from the home market that our industries must draw their strength to compete with third countries, whether they be countries with state-trading or capitalist economies. That is why we must make progress in the establishment of the common internal market.

Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC
Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag
Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes

Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office

St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 78 96 44

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

Via Meravigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/300

NETHERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 8595

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates

European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel. (91) 275 46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

Rua João de Deus
Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

FOMA

5, avenue de Longemalle
Case postale 367
CH 1020 Renens - Lausanne
Tél. (021) 35 13 61
Télex 25416

Sous-dépôt:

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

European Community Information
Service

2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

2182 St Catherine Street West
Montreal
Quebec H3H 1M7
Tel. (514) 937 3519

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise.

- report of proceedings,
 - annual indexes.
-

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1983/1984 ECU 52.59 BFR 2400 IRL 37 UKL 29 USD 49

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 2.94

BFR 160

IRL 2.40

UKL 2

USD 3.50



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-83-006-EN-C